DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 680 EA 006 131

TITLE Viewpoints: Contemporary Educational Issues. Reports of Educational Staff Seminar Programs, 1970-1972.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE [Feb 73]
NOTE 339p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$16.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; *Educational Policy; Educational Problems; *Educational Research; *Educational Technology; Federal Aid; Federal Government; Futures (of Society); *Governance; *Government Role; International Education; Post Secondary Education; Professional Personnel; Program Evaluation; Seminars; Special Education
IDENTIFIERS *Contemporary Issues

ABSTRACT

Educational Staff Seminar (ESS) is designed to assist professional staff members who are employed by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government to obtain a more realistic understanding of current educational practices and problems and to improve communications between Washington educational staff members and educators in the field. This document is a compilation of reports descriptive of many of the programs ESS has sponsored. The compilation shows the range and variety of programs which ESS has presented in its first four years and provides, in one accessible compilation, some viewpoints on contemporary policy issues which may be useful to ESS participants and their federal agencies and organizations. The program descriptions are divided into the broad issue areas of education and government, governance in the schools, research and educational futures, technology in education, postsecondary education, education of children with special learning needs, and education in other nations. (Author/MLF)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY   INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

ED 090680

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VIEWPOINTS:

CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Reports of Educational Staff Seminar Programs

1970-1972

[Feb 73]

EA 006 131

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 610
2000 L Street N.W.
Washington, D.C.
20036

Telephone
(202) 833-1737

Norman Drachler
Institute Director

Samuel Halperin
Director, Educational Staff Seminar

Michael O'Keefe
Director, Washington Internships in Education

FOREWORD

A recent monograph prepared for The President's Commission on School Finance, Improving Information Systems for Educational Policy Making, states that: "Participants in educational policy making--be they public officials, researchers, educators, or interested citizens--are handicapped by deficiencies in the available information on the state of American education."

The above conclusion coming from two knowledgeable and sophisticated educational researchers, Robert J. Goettel and Joel Berke,* underscores the importance and need for this publication. The reports written by various members of ESS are valuable for the process employed in seeking information--as well as for the contents and reactions reflected in these pages. Some of the reports are accounts of site visitations while others report on the interactions between a distinguished authority in a given discipline and a group of concerned officials seeking information and understanding.

There is also another gain to be derived from these experiences. The visitations or meetings with professionals in the field undoubtedly serve to stimulate the practitioners. Teachers, administrators, and researchers are affected by these encounters. They become more sensitive to issues in

American education that call for greater clarity and, together, they recognize the gaps in information or understanding that they must seek to supply.

As one peruses the pages of this publication there are helpful ideas for the improvement of American education as well as useful aids for men and women engaged in educational policy development. It is a helpful reference manual to ESS participants and a valuable guide for researchers in the field on issues or concerns expressed by individuals involved in the governance of education. This publication, then, is a step toward bridging the information gap that plagues American education.

Dr. Norman Drachler, Director
Institute for Educational
Leadership

---

*Drs. Berke and Goettel, it should be noted, are actively engaged in helping to bridge the policy information gap. Both have been frequent contributors to the Institute for Educational Leadership and the Educational Staff Seminar programs.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP,

NORMAN DRACHLER, Director

Educational Staff Seminar, SAMUEL HALPERIN, Director
Washington Internships in Education, MICHAEL O'KEEFE, Director
Health Staff Seminar, JUDITH K. MILLER, Director
Associates Program, MICHAEL USDAN, Coordinator
Scholar-in-Residence, STEPHEN K. BAILEY (1972-73 Scholar)

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword by Dr. Norman Drachler i

Contents 1

Viewpoints on Education: A Selection of ESS Reports 9

Part I ON EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT 11

Edward Zigler, (former) Director, Office of Child Development, and Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education and Welfare ("Evaluating Educational Change")

Rufus E. Miles, Jr., President, Population Reference Bureau, and James F. Kelly, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Georgetown University ("Should There Be An Independent, Cabinet-Level Department of Education?")

William Gorham, President, The Urban Institute and Bayla White and Joseph Wholey, Senior Research Staff Members, The Urban Institute ("Federal Evaluation Policy")

Douglass Cater, Senior Adviser, Academy for Educational Development ("Educational Policy-Making: A View from the White House Basement")

Amitai Etzioni, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, and Director, Center for Policy Research ("Policy Research: How Research May Be Made More Relevant To National Decision Makers; Policy Makers and Knowledge Makers")

Sidney P. Marland, Jr., (former) Commissioner of Education, U.S. Office of Education ("Policy Priorities and the Current State of American Education")

The Urban Coalition's Counterbudget, with Robert S. Benson, Director, National Priorities Project, and Douglas Ross, editor, education section

Seminar: "Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs?" Report on research into the distribution of Federal funds by the States and related issues in the governance of education, presented by Professors Joel Berke, Alan Campbell, Seymour Sacks of Syracuse, Michael Kirst of Stanford, and Anthony Cresswell of Carnegie-Mellon

Representative Lloyd Meeds (Democrat, Second District of Washington) ("The Congress and Educational Policy")

Honorable Charles F. Kurfess, Speaker, Ohio House of Representatives ("Education: A View From the States")

Monsignor Geno Baroni, Director, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, The Catholic University of America ("The White Ethnic Americans")

"Coordination of Federal Education Programs: Is It Really Possible?", with William Gaul, Associate General Counsel, House Committee on Education and Labor, "A View From The Congress"; Emerson Elliott, (former) Deputy Chief, Human Resources Programs, Office of Management and Budget, "Perspectives from the OMB"; Charles Kidd, Executive Secretary, Association of American Universities, "Comments from the Higher Education Community" (a joint meeting of ESS and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education)

Representative John Dellenback (Republican, Fourth District of Oregon) ("The Congress and Educational Policy")

Thomas E. Cronin, Research Political Scientist, The Brookings Institution ("Policy-Making: A View From The White House")

Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, U.S. General Accounting Office ("The GAO and the Evaluation of Educational Programs")

Part II ON GOVERNANCE IN THE SCHOOLS (1st yellow tab)

"The Struggle for Integrated Quality Education in South Carolina--Two Insiders' Subjective Views," with Frieda Mitchell, Field Supervisor, Penn Community Services and Member, Beaufort County School Board, and M. Hayes Mizell, Director American Friends Service Committee and Member, Board of School Commissioners of Richland County School District #1

Dave Selden, President, American Federation of Teachers, and William H. Simons, President, D.C. Teachers' Union ("Teacher Militancy in the 70's")

Hugh J. Scott, Superintendent, D.C. Public Schools ("Leading the D.C. Public Schools")

Environmental Education Workshop: Catoctin Mountain Park, Thurmont, Maryland, with staff from U.S. Office Of Education, Environmental Protection Agency, National Park Service, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and student teachers from the Montgomery County Schools

Field Trip: Education in South Carolina: Meetings With Governor Robert McNair and State Superintendent of Education Cyril Busbee, Chairman of the State Advisory Committee Robert Davis; visits to Williamsburg County Manpower Center and elementary programs, Midlands Technical Education Center, state ETV, South Carolina State College at Orangeburg

Allen Graubard, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Department of Humanities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Timothy Affleck, Co-Director, The Community School, Santa Barbara, California ("Alternative Schools in America")

"Serrano v. Priest: Milestone or Millstone for Urban School Finance?", with Joel S. Berke, The Brookings Institution and the Syracuse University Research Corporation, and reactions by Betsy Levin, Director of Educational Studies, The Urban Institute; Phyllis Myers, Senior Editor, City Magazine, The National Urban Coalition; Arthur Levin, Executive Vice President, Potomac Institute; Sarah Carey, Assistant Director, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Norman Karsh, Executive Director, President's Commission on School Finance

"After Rodriguez: What Impact For The School Finance Cases?", with presentations by attorneys George Liebmann, Stephen Browning (Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law), and reactions by Richard E. Merritt, Special Assistant, National Legislative Conference, and Robert Goettel, Associate Director, Educational Finance and Governance Program, Syracuse University

Part III ON RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL FUTURES (2nd yellow tab)

Charles Blaschke, President, Education Turnkey Systems, Inc., John O. Wilson, (former) Assistant Director for Planning, Research and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity, and others ("Performance Contracting")

"Educational Laboratories and R&D Centers: Their Role in American Education," with directors of labs and centers

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, The Smithsonian Institution ("Museums as Institutional Alternatives to Formal Education")

Ronald E. Barnes, Director of Educational Planning for the Minnesota Experimental City and Professor, Experimental Studies Program, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota ("Education for the 21st Century")

Otto F. Kraushaar, Director, "A Study of the American Independent School," and former President, Goucher College, and Edward D'Alessio, Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Catholic Conference ("What Future for Private Schools in the United States?")

Field Trip: Educational Policy Research at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts, with Sheldon White, Roy E. Larsen Professor of Educational Psychology; Marshall Smith, Assistant Professor of Education and Director of the Evaluation Study of the planned variation program of Head Start; Paul Diamond, Center for Law and Education; David Cohen, Professor of Education and Social Policy and Director of Center for Educational Policy Research; Professor Walter McCann, Chairman of the Program on Administration; Gerald Lesser, Bigelow Professor of Education and Developmental Psychology

George R. Hall, Senior Economist, Management Sciences Department, Rand Corporation, and Charles Stalford, Project Manager, Performance Contracting Experiment, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity ("Performance Contracting: Is It Really Dead?")

Field Trip: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey (first visit)

Field Trip: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey (second visit)

Charles Williams, Deputy Director, Center for the Study of Social Policy, Stanford Research Institute ("Educational Policy-Makers Are Unprepared For Tomorrow: Discontinuities In The Issues of the 70's")

Seminar: "Educational Vouchers: The OEO Program in 1972 and Beyond," with staff of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity, including Thomas K. Glennan, Jr., (former) Director and Jeffrey Schiller, Director, Experimental Research Division; Bill Jefferds, Superintendent, Alum Rock School District, California; Frank Wilkens, Principal, Alum Rock; Judith Areen, Center for the Study of Public Policy, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dan Weiler, Rand Corporation

Seminar: "The Future of Research and Development in Education; Some Perspectives on the National Institute of Education," with Sheldon White, Roy E. Larsen Professor of Educational Psychology, and David K. Cohen, Executive Director, Center for Educational Policy Research, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

Part IV ON TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION (3rd yellow tab)

Anthony G. Oettinger, Harvard University ("A True Believer's Skeptical View of Educational Technology")

Field Trip: Quakertown and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania ("Individualized Prescribed Instruction" and the work of Research for Better Schools, a regional education lab)

"Communications Satellites: Their Capabilities and Potential," at COMSAT Corporation (co-sponsored with the Health Staff Seminar)

Workshop: Teleproductions: Using Educational Video Technology, presented by dta/TELEPRODUCTIONS, inc.

Site visit: National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland

Part V ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION (4th yellow tab)

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., (former) President, University of Connecticut and Consultant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare ("Contemporary Policy Issues in Higher Education")

Field Trip: Rockview Correctional Institution, University Park, Pennsylvania, "Project NewGate"--an experimental higher education program preparing prison inmates for college admission

David Ifshin, (former) President, and Don Shall, Vice President, National Student Association ("The College Campus Today and the Work of NSA")

Lattie Coor, Vice Chancellor, Washington University, and Gerald Grant, Harvard University ("The Mood on Campus: Its Implications for the University and for Society at Large")

Three presidents of predominantly Black colleges: Wendell P. Russell, Virginia State, James E. Peoples, Jr., Jackson State; and Herman Branson, Lincoln University

Site visit: Washington Technical Institute and meeting with President Cleveland Dennard

Field Trip: Cape Fear Technical Institute, Wilmington, North Carolina, marine technology programs and briefing on the North Carolina Community College System

"Institutional Assistance to Higher Education: A Continuing Exploration," with James Hester, President, New York University; Virginia Smith, Associate Director, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; Alexander Astin, Director of Research, American Council on Education; Allan Ostar, Executive Director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Frank Newman, Associate Director for University Relations, Stanford University

Thomas Corcoran, Research Associate, Syracuse University Education Policy Research Center ("Community Colleges: Unequal Educational Opportunity?")

Edmund J. Gleazer, Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges and David S. Bushnell, Research Director, Project Focus ("New Hope for Community: The Community College; A Report on Project Focus")

"A Report on the Commission on Nontraditional Study," with Samuel Gould, Chairman (a joint program of ESS and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education)

Field Trip: Fashion Institute of Technology, New York City

Field Trip: "Occupational Education in Oklahoma," including visits to Oklahoma State Technical School, Wayne Miller, Director and Vice-President, Oklahoma State University; Tulsa Area Vocational-Technical Education Center, Joe W. Lemley, Principal; meetings with Arch Alexander, Assistant Director, State Department of Vocational and Technical Education

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Professor of Education and Director of Specialty Oriented Student Research Program, School of Education, University of Maryland ("The Key Role of Guidance and Counseling in Vocational and Manpower Programs")

Rupert Evans, Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana ("Skills Centers and Their Lessons for Vocational Education")

Part VI ON THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL LEARNING NEEDS

(5th yellow tab)

James S. Coleman, Professor, Department of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins University

Site visits: Three types of day care in D.C., with Thomas C. Taylor, Executive Director, Child Day Care Association, Inc.

Helen Scheirbeck, Director, Indian Affairs Unit, Office of Special Concerns, U.S. Office of Education, and Anita Pfeiffer, Harvard Graduate School of Education ("The Education of American Indians")

Afternoon discussion session to evaluate Indian education field trip

Field Trip: "The Chicano Community of Los Angeles," visits to schools, community centers, county hospital, various public services, meetings with community leaders, etc.

Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, (Democrat, Twenty-first District of California), and Bernard Watson, Chairman, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Temple University ("A Report on the National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks")

Field Trip: "Education of Handicapped Children in Hartford, Connecticut Area," including visits to the University of Connecticut, School of Education; programs for the handicapped in a residential setting, inner city public school, rural public school, etc.

Field Trip: "How Pennsylvania Serves Handicapped Children," including a discussion of the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children decision and its impact on Pennsylvania's mentally retarded children; meetings with John C. Pittenger, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, parents of handicapped children, Right to Education Office

Part VII ON EDUCATION IN OTHER NATIONS* (6th yellow tab)

"Report of a Field Trip: Education in the U.S.S.R."; observations by 1971 trip participants

Seminar: "Early Childhood Education: A European Point of View," with Karl Stukat, Department of Educational Research, Gothenburg School of Education, Gothenburg, Sweden; Anthony de Vries, Pedagogisch Instituut Van De Rijksuniversiteit, Utrecht, Netherlands; Olaf Magnussen, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development; Gilbert Austin, Head of the Project on Early Childhood Education, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, Paris, France

Seminar: "Research from Israel on Child Development," with presentations by Moshe Smilansky, Professor of Sociology of Education and Comparative Education, and Sara Smilansky, Professor, Department of Psychology, both of Tel Aviv University, Israel

Ruth Sidel, author, Women and Child Care in Communist China ("Education and Early Childhood in Communist China")

Appendix I: Description of the Educational Staff Seminar (back of volume

---

*Reports of two ESS overseas missions are also available: Impressions of Education in the U.S.S.R. (1971); Impressions of Education in Israel (1972). A chronology of other ESS domestic activities is also available from the ESS office.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

VIEWPOINTS ON EDUCATION: A SELECTION OF ESS REPORTS

Since ESS began programming on February 3, 1969, it has organized and sponsored 175 activities. These have included dinner, luncheon (and even breakfast) discussion meetings, all-day seminars, one - five day site visits, and extended educational tours to three countries abroad. Early in the program, participants indicated that they would like to have a summary of activities for later reference, for their supervisors, or for the benefit of Federal aides who had not attended the original activity. Consequently, reports were compiled by one of the participants or, in the case of longer field trips, by several participants. These reports are designed as a summary, usually solely descriptive, occasionally personalized and subjective--of a given program, rather than as a "carefully researched scientific paper" on the topic at hand.

Several ESS participants have commented that they keep a running file of these reports to refresh their memories about a particular program or policy issue. This compilation is designed with two primary purposes in mind: (1) to show the range and variety of programs which ESS has presented in its first four years, and (2) to provide, in one accessible compilation, some viewpoints on contemporary policy issues which may be useful to ESS participants and their Federal agencies and organizations.

For purposes of organizing this compilation, ESS programs have been divided into seven broad issue areas: on Education and Government; on Governance In the Schools; on Research and Educational Futures; on Technology in Education; on Post-Secondary Education; on The Education of Children With Special Learning Needs; on Education in Other Nations.

--Samuel Halperin
Jonathan Brown
Dietra Rogers
Ann Hymes

PART I

VIEWPOINTS: ON EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT

In reviewing the wide range of Federal and State policies affecting educational outcomes, one must consider the organizational pressures on each participant in the process. Role definition among the various segments of the educational community at the Federal level and between the States and local educational agencies and the Federal Government is a continuing part of the policy process in education. A firmer understanding of the dynamics of these pressures may help Federal educational policy makers to deal more effectively with them to the ultimate benefit of those in the educational system.

A major portion of ESS programs have centered on discussions of the interaction of various branches of government in the educational process. For example, ESS has presented viewpoints of the Congressional role in formulating educational policy; the role of the White House in determining national policies; and a perspective of the changing roles of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Comptroller General of the United States spoke on the expanded role of the GAO in the evaluation of program effectiveness.

Organizational pressures among the various components in the educational process have also been discussed in ESS programs. These programs have ranged over problems of coordinating Federal educational programs, the Urban Coalition's "Counterbudget", to a debate on the merits of establishing a Cabinet-level Department of Education.....

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE", SEPTEMBER 28, 1970

DR. EDWARD F. ZIGLER
Director, Office of Child Development, DHEW

Dr. Edward M. Zigler, Director of HEW's Office of Child Development, began his talk on evaluation by commenting generally on social policy. Until recent years, he noted, social policy was founded on the society's social philosophy, its values, its prejudices. Recently, however, social policy has taken on more technocratic tones. Evaluations have assumed an important role in the articulation of social policy. Often, evaluation has meant cost-benefit analysis. Zigler attributed a "pseudo scientific" quality to this trend, arguing that it is too easy to select among evaluations to support one's prejudices.

An unfortunate aspect of the emphasis on evaluation, Zigler maintained, is researchers' increasing willingness to offer social policy recommendations which cannot be adequately supported by their research. Usually, such recommendations are quite premature, but the public does not realize this. Poor evaluations, Zigler said, are either of little assistance or are actively dangerous, since they encourage poor social policy.

Thanks to poor evaluation, we are now hearing that "compensatory education has failed." That conclusion has arisen from the Westinghouse Head Start study, Jensen's studies, and so on--none of which have actually proven the conclusion.

Zigler argued that all of these evaluations are basically flawed because they accept overoptimistic political rhetoric as the genuine goals of the programs. They also fail to state clearly the specific goals of specific programs (lumping, for instance, the goals of thousands of different Head Start programs developed by as many different communities together for a statement of goals). Finally, Zigler felt, evaluations often fail to assess the goals properly.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Zigler gave Head Start as an example of a program where evaluators have accepted irrational expectations as real program goals. Head Start, he recalled, was tremendously oversold--people actually expected that, with one small dose of Head Start, children would be permanently freed from the educational effects of poverty. The Westinghouse study accepted this premise; we found the evaluators absurdly testing children three years after a simple 6-week Head Start experience to see if achievement gains could be seen. Given unrealistic though popular predictions of Head Start's success, he noted, that kind of assessment makes sense. The problem is accepting these predictions as a basis for evaluation. Zigler felt that Sesame Street is getting the same kind of oversell now. Sesame Street is not going to be the answer either, and as he noted in answer to a question, he thinks that interaction with an adult is much better for a child than passive absorption in television.

Zigler traced the early optimism about the impact of compensatory education to a popular mystique about the intellect's plasticity. The work of Hunt, Bruner, Engelman and others encouraged the view that cognitive ability could be altered readily by proper intervention technology. Press comment on programs that, for instance, guaranteed a 10-point IQ gain a year reinforced optimism about the intellect's plasticity.

Zigler concluded that our ability to influence cognition has been oversold. We have convinced ourselves that social equality can be gotten "on the cheap," and we couldn't have been more wrong. Effecting intelligence is extremely difficult. We will never be able to repeal the law of human biological variability. His own studies have indicated that any well-run program can effect 10-point IQ increases by motivating participants to use their intelligence more effectively.

"Achievements" are less difficult than cognition to influence environmentally, and emotional-motivational factors are the easiest to alter. Evaluations have concentrated on cognition and achievements, ignoring the possibility that the third factor--emotional motivational aspects--is the most important in determining whether or not someone "makes it" in the society. This means such things as how a child feels about himself and the world around him, independence, initiative, and so on.

Social competence, not intelligence, should be the main focus of evaluation, although that alone would still be too narrow a goal for Head Start. One of the reasons this has been ignored is a dearth of instruments to measure elements of social competence.

But Zigler argued that this is no excuse. If this is what is important, we must devote more energy and resources to developing such tools. When asked about possible development of an "MQ"--"motivational quotient"--Zigler said that although there have been some steps in that direction (McClelland's work in need-achievement for instance), no one has put them together into an MQ. He does believe it can be done. Someone asked why he couldn't find work on an MQ from OCD research and development funds--Zigler retorted that he really has no discretionary money.

Zigler pointed to the areas in which Head Start has produced measurable progress. Nutrition and health improvement has been impressive and the data is as hard as one could ask. Head Start has also done well in training the poor for pre-school education careers, and,as the Kirschner report concludes, in bringing healthy community change. Finally, the program has clearly affected parents' sense of satisfaction and the government's responsiveness to them.

The Westinghouse study did not deal with any of these areas, nor with the more general emotional-motivational factors. Even within these limits, the study was less refined than it should have been. It dealt with Head Start participants as a homogeneous group instead of breaking them down into different categories to see if they were effected in different ways. No attempt was made to distinguish among Head Start programs either, though programs vary greatly in goals, techniques, etc. The study failed to take note of the impact elementary schools have on Head Start children although earlier studies had shown children making progress in Head Start but losing those gains once they got to poor quality elementary schools.

As with other such evaluations, Zigler felt that the Westinghouse study wouldn't be so troublesome if it weren't treated as a definitive analysis. He blamed "the experts" for overselling their own trade, for losing the modesty appropriate to one who knows the limitations of his work. And he pointed out that the "cost benefit" approach to social policy cannot deal with "quality of life" questions to which we should be turning more attention.

--Reported by Holly Knox
(attendance: 67 persons)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT: *
"SHOULD THERE BE AN INDEPENDENT, CABINET-LEVEL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION?"

"YES!"--Rufus E. Miles, Jr., President, Population Reference Bureau
"NO!"--James F. Kelly, Vice President for Administrative Affairs,
Georgetown University
December 2, 1970

Miles said his primary reason for supporting the creation of a Department of Education and Manpower was that education needs the best leadership available in the country. The 77 million people in the student generation require a mammoth amount of attention and assistance. There must be a much closer relationship between educational and employment opportunities. Miles felt it important to have a Department which encompasses education but is not limited to traditional educational ideas. Such a department would bring together the issues and problems young people are now grappling with.

Tracing the legislative history of HEW, Miles discussed the greatly enlarged Federal role in health, education, and welfare areas. He felt there is no longer any reason to group the areas together.

Miles felt the executive branch is now out of balance; HEW has more than its fair share of domestic responsibility. No single Congressional committee has jurisdiction over its activities. Education suffers when other HEW activities represent uncontrollable appropriations items. He felt the chances of getting a better share of the Federal dollar would be greatly enhanced if education were not in HEW.

Kelly felt an improved and strengthened policy in education, and the wherewithal to carry it out, is a desirable objective. He did not feel that the creation of a department was a sine qua non, since he feared the Federal Government is becoming so fragmented that cabinet status is not meaningful. Kelly felt that decision-making is now more important at the staff level than at the line level. He preferred to minimize the number of departments and the concomitant number of people supposed to report to the President. He urged the creation of conglomerates within the Executive Branch. He cited the merger of the War and Navy Departments into the Department of Defense as an example of the decline of the White House staff role and rise of the Executive department role in decision making in the area of national security.

Kelly felt it impossible to conclude that HEW has failed in its mission, over its 17-year history. However, he felt there are areas in which a cohesive national policy has not been developed. He felt that using the existing facility to develop such policy, as in education, would be more effective than creation of a new mechanism. Kelly felt HEW is more manageable today than it was 10-15 years ago.

Kelly felt creation of a Department of Education and Manpower would do violence to the concept of diversity of sources of funding, with the resultant elimination of diversity of outlook which characterizes current methods of funding educational institutions. He felt current efforts to standardize reporting requirements for education programs will go a long way toward meeting the needs expressed by those who urge creation of a department. Kelly proposed that HEW continue its current path, and that education gain sufficient status to justify an Under Secretary for Education, with various operating agencies for differing levels of education and related activities. Just because every banana republic has a minister of education does not mean this is a desirable structure for the Federal Government. Kelly felt that good government can best be achieved by fewer departments, not more of them. He felt the President should treat cabinet officers as "seniors among equals," strong advisors in their areas of interest. Kelly urged that other areas of education, such as Indian education or Fulbright-Hays, should be merged into HEW, to create a more effective conglomerate, rather than separating education from the rest of the Department.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Kelly was asked how many former Commissioners of Education would agree that the best place to be was part of a conglomerate. Kelly agreed that probably none would but urged that Cabinet departments be reduced to a number whose heads would be real Presidential advisers.

Kelly was asked whether budget cuts in a single or many agencies made any difference. He agreed that policy changes across a number of government agencies, in piecemeal fashion, can have a great effect on education. He expressed concern that the reason for Federal support is primarily to meet defined federal objectives.

The speakers were asked about the possibility of a Department of Defense model. Miles did not favor this, feeling that such an arrangement would make the Secretary's job almost impossible. Kelly added that Marion Folsom had advised against creation of such an independent power structure. Instead he urged creation of Under Secretary positions with close working relationships to the Secretary. Some such steps were taken in the health field, and Kelly agreed with Miles that it hadn't truly worked.

Miles was asked whether, if a Department of Education and Manpower were created in a few years there wouldn't be a need to split up the department, since education would again be a 2nd class citizen. Miles felt this was unlikely, given the strength of education intersts. He added that he does not recommend that all means of supporting education, especially higher education, be removed from agencies of which they are a prime interest, to be placed in a new Department. He agreed that diversity of sources of support is a healthy thing.

Kelly was asked how a new Administration can revitalize an existing bureaucracy. Kelly stressed the importance of a career professional staff with continuity plus responsiveness to the goals of the Administration and its expressions of public policy. Kelly felt both the career side and the political side of the executive branch need better articulation of their roles and relationships.

The speakers were asked whether HEW couldn't be better organized if commercial regulation and income maintenance activities weren't split off, leaving HEW with a service-institution-building function. Miles felt all the ramifications of the question would take some time to work out, given the complexity of HEW's concerns. He questioned whether such a solution would effectively reduce the load on the Secretary. Kelly felt such a solution would lack substance and wisdom. He felt splitting off income maintanance programs would raise the danger of creating an uncontrollable independent agency. He preferred that Social Security remain a part of integral program objectives, rather than becoming an end in itself.

Miles was asked what would be left of the Labor Department if a new Department of Education and Manpower were created. He urged the inclusion of currently independent labor agencies, such as the Mediation Service, in the Department.

Kelly was asked if the President were not better able to exercise his leadership function if decision-making functions were fragmented and therefore not confronting him almost on a one-to-one basis, as they would in a conglomerate situation. Kelly agreed this was an area of concern, but felt that the President would have to make his Cabinet selections more on the the basis of commitment to objectives, rather than on the basis of political relationships.

--Reported by Jean Frohlicher
(attendance: 71 persons)

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*
PRESENTATION ON "FEDERAL EVALUATION POLICY"
January 19, 1971

Mr. William Gorham, President of the Urban Institute and former HEW Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation) chaired the meeting. His opening comments presented a series of problems that face anyone who is evaluating socially relevant problems. His first major point was that for the first time social evaluation is being taken seriously and the results of the evaluation are eagerly sought after, and, hopefully, productively used, in making future decisions. The question of how to do social evaluation has become very important. Many of the traditional experimental methods being used are being seriously challenged as inappropriate. A most pressing problem is - what capability does the system have for using the information when it receives it?

By implication, it was suggested that many social institutions such as education do not know how to use information efficiently and well. The most pressing problem from Mr. Gorham's position was the maintaining of a sustained effort in the area of evaluation. This would suggest some concern at the Federal, state and local level for the institutionalization of evaluation.

Mr. Gorham then introduced Dr. Joseph Wholey and Miss Bayla White, senior research staff members of the Urban Institute. Dr. Wholey was the first director of evaluation in the office of the Secretary, HEW, and was deeply involved in the first nationwide sampling of the effects of Title I, in a report done by the General Electric (TEMPO) Company.

Miss White began the presentation by saying that evaluation should be designed to be useful to policymakers. So far the major evaluation efforts have been concentrated on Title I. The reason for this is that Title I is approximately 30% of the Office of Education budget. Title I programs are found in 16,000 districts in the United States affecting eight to nine million children. She noted that it was the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 which first mandated any kind of evaluation. The process of evaluation is very difficult in this situation because it is the LEA's who formulate the proposals, the SEA's who approve them, and the Federal government which hands out the money. It is difficult, therefore, for the Federal government to impose real and meaningful restraints on the states and local educational agencies in terms of upgrading their evaluation efforts.

Miss White was an advocate of evaluation being done at three levels. She pointed out that the three levels should have different aims and objectives. She maintained that so far only impact evaluation has been done on Title I in general. The questions raised on an impact evaluation have essentially been these. 1. Do the children learn more under Title I than they would have without it? 2. Has Title I worked in the sense of accomplishing what the proposers of the projects design them to do? 3. What impact has it had on the educational establishment?

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Miss White maintains that these are the wrong questions and that they lead to the possibility of almost no decisions, because they do not provide alternatives for decision-makers to make choices from. They only give yes and no answers to specific questions. The results of the impact evaluations which have been done at the LEA level in general have been passed on to the State Departments of Education and ultimately to the Federal government. By the time the reports and evaluations have gone through this boiling-down process, they are of little or no use to the Federal government. Because of these problems, the Office of Education in 1967 created a first national survey of Title I. Because of the difficulties inherent in doing that particular survey a group was formed, known as the Belmont Group. This is a joint Federal-state partnership which is presently surveying the results of Federal involvement in the area of education in a systematic and on-going basis. Miss White noted that Belmont probably costs the Federal government somewhere in the neighborhood of about four million dollars a year, but that this is a relatively small amount when you consider it against the ten million dollars that LEA's are presently spending on evaluations of Title I, which, from her point of view, have little or no value.

Miss White feels that there is no comparability in evaluation between one local educational agency and another. There is no uniformity in the kinds of research done, nor in the methods by which it might be interpreted and used. She cited several other reasons why impact studies on a national sample would be almost impossible. 1. the impossibility of drawing a random sample; 2. the problems associated with very high mobility rates of disadvantaged children (some school systems have a mobility rate in excess of 100% of the children per year); 3. it is unclear that there are well-established goals for the projects to be measured against; and 4. finally, Title I is commonly viewed as general aid by the school systems, and therefore so thinly spread that to try and differentiate its effects from the effects of the money being spent on the regular system is almost impossible.

Dr. Wholey began by saying that he felt the expenditure of ten million dollars by the LEA's for evaluations on a local level was nearly a national scandal, and that the results were in no way comparable from project to project. No real decisions or changes in the projects were being made as a result of the evaluations, and evaluators were the only people who were benefiting from this particular largesse. He said a good deal of the blame for this should be placed on the Federal shoulders, since it is by Federal requirements which call for evaluation but don't spell out what they mean by it. He offered this as a more positive area of effort in evaluation.

He suggested that the SEA's should be concerned with project rating in the LEA's and that they should try to find 8 to 10 similar type projects in a state and then look at them in considerable depth and try to rate them against their own proposed objectives. This could be done perhaps on some kind of rating scale, and the public could be kept well informed of the findings. Suggestions could be made for the projects that seemed to be weak, and the findings could be disseminated on those that were strong, so that others might use those models in their educational systems. He further suggested that SEA's have the capability of not allowing LEA's to be the recipients of more money unless they do improve under some such rating system the quality of their local products.

He further commented that the present evaluation efforts are totally out of phase with the decision-making process. The results are commonly available from the previous year's evaluation, only in October or November of the following year, when all of the curriculum has been set, the children have been assigned to classes, and the decisions made. He suggested that in Pennsylvania, for instance, it will take twenty years for the State Department of Education to complete the cycle as it is presently proposed for visiting all of the LEA's. How, then, he asks, can the State Department of Education make any impact on the state of Pennsylvania if it does not modify its present activities? He pointed out that Title I was not considered by its authors to be an experimental or research program. It was designed to put money where the need was, and the need, he maintained, was concerned with educating poor children. He stressed that we should move toward the ability to make meaningful comparisons across projects.

Dr. James Abert, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Evaluation and Monitoring, described the typical Title I program. 60% of them are concerned with reading programs, about 20% with kindergarten, about 20% with work study programs. He suggested that under this kind of generalized heading, it would be possible to bring together large groups of school systems, perhaps city school systems, and make comparisons across city school systems.

Dr. Thomas Glennan, the director of evaluation for OEO, maintained that there was a high need to make the best out of a bad situation, that there were possibilities for evaluation, both in the natural and in the experimental situations, and that it should not be offered as an either/or dichotomy.

A comment was made from the floor that it was important to remember that it was Robert Kennedy who had fought hard for the inclusion of evaluation in the Elementary and Secondary School Act because it would provide some checks and balances for the citizens to enable them to make comparisons between a variety of educational attempts.

Dr. Halperin, speaking to the same point, noted that in terms of the history of ESEA, Robert Kennedy wanted to give some weapons and some ability to ask hard questions to the lay public about the way the educators were spending their money. He had little faith in the fact that educators would spend it properly and well if there were no checks or balances provided for the public.

The question was asked - what would have been the effect on Title I at the moment if there had been no evaluations? No one seemed to have a good answer. It was suggested that the results of the evaluation had not in any meaningful way impacted upon the appropriations or lack of appropriations for Title I.

John Evans, Associate Commissioner of the Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, indicated that he believed there were many problems with doing an overall impact national evaluation study but that the benefits to be derived from that study made it worthy of the effort. He said there was probably no other way of providing Congress and the people with answers to the question - Is Title I doing what the people and the Congress presently want it do do? He indicated that he did not accept it as a given that the program would continue in its present form, and that evaluation would have no impact on that. The discovery of what does work and the dissemination of that information should be a very high priority item for the U. S. Office of Education.

Several people suggested that there are other ways of measuring the effect of Title I, such as attendance rates, vandalism rates, etc. and that one does not need to restrict himself solely to achievement test data. Dr. Abert raised the question of whether the cost of adequately evaluating a program such as Title I was worth it when in fact evaluations were so expensive and took such vast amounts of money away from the children who desperately needed the assistance.

In conclusion, it was suggested that one of the major points to remember was that Title I was only five years old, and that one of the most important aspects of the Kennedy amendments was to get the idea of evaluation established in the Office of Education and in education across the country. In this sense Senator Kennedy's efforts had probably been quite successful.

--reported by Gilbert Austin

(attendance: 63 persons)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "POLICY-MAKING IN EDUCATION: A VIEW FROM THE WHITE HOUSE BASEMENT"

MARCH 1, 1971

DOUGLASS CATER
Former Special Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964-68
now
Senior Adviser, Academy for Educational Development

Cater noted that the process of government had become more mysterious to him as a result of four years in the White House. Before that period, as a journalist he'd known exactly where power lay in Washington. He commented that when he'd come to Washington in the early 50's, he'd discovered that the press constitutes the "fourth branch of government." Later, he became aware of the "clusters of government" which exercise power over various specific areas of interest.

When Cater came to the White House, the "subgovernment" for education was a pathetic one. Warring interest groups and meager Federal bureaucracy provided no real power base. As recently as 1963, Cater felt Congress really didn't care about education. A highly energetic President committed to education, combined with lobbies tired of fighting each other, changed this picture, building a more purposeful subgovernment for education.

Cater noted each title of each Act passed constituted a balancing of ideas and politics. He felt existing legislation represents a sweeping commitment to education. The question today is whether we are going to live up to this commitment. Old tensions can still rise up and cause stalemate.

Cater felt the ideas of NIE and NFHE were basically good, although he is not sure of their political viability. It takes strong White House support to assure that new initiatives, which lack strong constituencies, receive proper Congressional attention. He is not convinced by present arguments for revenue sharing.

Cater expressed surprise at the strength of education's subgovernment, when the "Charlie Lee lobby" managed twice in a row to overturn the Administration's budget.

As to the future of the subgovernment, Cater felt it cannot rely on the White House, as Presidents cannot be counted on for a sustained commitment to any single area. He felt the creation of an informal group, such as ESS, is important to maintain discussion of education's goals without partisan rancor.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Asked what kind of support the Federal Government should give education and how to measure effect, Cater opined that the major breakthroughs occurred in ESEA's commitment to the disadvantaged. This commitment made school boards do what they know they have to do. Cater was unimpressed with the statement that "our education programs haven't worked," since few programs prove themselves in so short a time.

Asked "where do we go from here? Do we stagnate with current programs or go someplace else?", Cater questioned whether people feel closer to State and local governments than they do to the Federal Government; even if a significantly larger amount of funds were allocated to revenue sharing, he questioned whether better education would be the ultimate beneficiary.

Asked why he felt education would not benefit from revenue sharing, when it comprises about 40 percent of State and local budgets, Cater questioned whether national priorities can be maintained, especially in the light of pressure for teacher salary increases.

Cater was asked if OE isn't being asked to bail out higher education from the plight caused by decreased funding from other Federal agencies. Cater agreed that this is, in some measure, true, as Federal policy in higher education has too rarely considered institutional needs. For this reason, he supports the concept of the Foundation, although at a level far higher than $100 million. Such a level would take sustained White House support.

Cater was asked whether we are not now facing a crisis in purpose--a sense of questioning answers once taken as true--rather than a lessening of commitment. He agreed that new means of education need to be found, but did not feel that the crisis was such that Congress was ready to cease funding education programs.

Cater was asked, if revenue sharing is not enacted, how State and local governments can be more involved in decision-making and priority-sharing. Cater felt Johnson-era programs did much to strengthen State and local capabilities. He does not feel that "putting the money on a stump" will do anything to strengthen such abilities.

Cater was asked if it were possibly true that higher education has been "oversold," and, if so, what the remedy is. He agreed that there is great public discontent, especially in the health services area. He has often wondered if the Federal Government could not achieve the same ends with a lower level of rhetoric.

Cater was asked what he would recommend the Federal Government do today in the areas of higher education and child care centers. Cater replied that there are only two ways a President can respond, to commit more resources or to commit less. He felt national priorities should be sustained by the Federal Government.

Asked if most State and local governments were not able to handle revenue sharing, he did not want to denigrate State and local governments, but questioned whether they are truly nearer the people. He felt that it would be preferable to adopt a system of incentives which would encourage States to adopt progressive taxation.

Cater was asked if a President were better served through a strong White House staff or a strong cabinet. He felt a balance should be maintained. The White House staff should be organized according to the work habits of the President.

Cater was asked where the Federal education role can go, with partisanship neutralizing Congressional initiatives. He felt the dream of a purposeful President who can pull education out of its doldrums may be only wishful thinking. In addition, there may be a public crisis of doubt on how strong they want their President to be.

Cater was asked about building evaluation into Federal education programs. He agreed that evaluation is desirable, although he had no specific ideas for building such measures into legislation.

Asked how the fourth branch of government can be "educated," Cater replied that he chastises journalism for covering education at a level only slightly above religion.

Cater was asked to comment on Nixon's budget priorities, which were seen as similar to those of the last days of the Johnson Administration, on the Emergency School Aid Act, and on proposals for a Department of Education. He felt education should be raised to at least an undersecretaryship, if not to Department status. He supported the general concept of the Emergency School Aid Act.

--reported by Jean S. Frohlicher
(attendance: 49 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* "POLICY MAKERS AND KNOWLEDGE MAKERS"

April 15, 1971

DR. AMITAI ETZIONI

Chairman, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, and
Director, Center for Policy Research

In advocating a "marriage" between decision makers and knowledge producers in order to advance effective use of Federal resources in broad social areas (like education), Dr. Etzioni suggested we first need to examine the conditions under which we can guide social policy. When societies change, they don't always change in the way people will them to. Studies of the impact of government programs show that something other than that which was intended is likely to have greater societal impact. The economists, in their attempt to build a social theory, have come to face the same problem in the Keynesian notion of "willful change versus everything else that is happening." Therefore, despite their rise in influence among social sciences in policy determination, they must rely heavily on distilled common sense, as well as econometric models. The fact is, Etzioni argued, we have no adequate theory on how to regulate the social processes. However, we may be close to such a theory and referred to his The Active Society, with the caution that although we may have the knowledge to guide society, it doesn't mean that we have the political will to do it.

Dr. Etzioni then focussed attention on how to guide social processes. Knowledge is certainly essential to a guiding mechanism, but by itself is weak. Much of what people think is social guidance, he said, is social theatrics. For example, much fanfare is given to announcing a new appointment or a new program under the banner of progress, but falls far short of solving real problems. We seem too often prone to jump from idea to program, with little knowledge of how to get there, with almost no evidence that it will work, or without exploring or understanding associated consequences. To use knowledge effectively to design, test, and implement programs addressed to solving social problems requires a linkage between the knowledge producers and decision makers that is generally not being met in the USA or elsewhere. As a consequence, we act in ignorance.

Etzioni offered several reasons why he thought the two groups were having difficulty in linking. One roadblock was the myth of scientists that research should not be guided, that guidance will stifle the inventive spirit.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

When we are dealing with physical processes we can be very directive but when it comes to intellectual processes we are hesitant to tell anyone what to do. He doubted that there was consistent evidence on either side and cited several prominent examples of where direction only served to whet the inventive spirit (the Wright brothers, e.g.). Basic researchers should be able to follow their own paths but this was not necessarily the case in social areas and problem solving which were more of an applied nature.

A second problem dealt with basic research. He favors at least 10 percent of our resources being spent consistently on basic research, but basic research was overdone and was a poor way of solving problems, " like seeding oceans to deliver bread on a particular shore." Basic research is not a finite enterprise; the more we know, the more we don't know. Etzioni tagged it a "glorious entertainment that should be allowed in an affluent society," but cautioned that we should not kid ourselves about what it will yield. We cannot bridge the gap directly from knowledge to problem solution, but need a mediary. No one would invite a biologist to treat him, but would go to a doctor instead. Medical doctors rely on distilled common sense, experience, rule of thumb, the latest knowledge they have picked up, as well as inputs from analytic science. The tradition of analytic science is to fragment reality to study a part of it and its relation to all else. No one scientist can really do this, let alone a policy maker. The reason no one can put it all together is that at the base of each analytic science there is a set of assumptions which are incompatible. What we do in social problem solving is draw upon disciplines which are nonanalytic, which draw upon reality. We must therefore give due attention to applied disciplines and interdisciplinary activities because they are problem or goal-oriented.

Another myth which must be put to rest is the belief in the transferability of findings, most prevalent in the applied discipline areas. Working on the problems of a better educational system will not come up with better health, etc.

A fourth problem area which seems to keep the decision makers and knowledge makers from linking is priority setting. As it is, funds become available where social problems become visible and even basic research is shifted around in relation to social needs. There is no question that there is authority in this process, but who among the nonknowledge makers will set priority and guide knowledge making to guide society? Will the work be done inhouse or outside? If inside, where is the talent, objectivity, and quality control. If outside, how will it be done? Neither grant nor contract, the two principle procedures seem to have worked very well. Through grants, money is handed out to applicants with little or no control. Committees of peers award the money and ask no questions. There is no intervention by the grantor; he shapes no behavior of the applicant and the grant procedure becomes immune from the priority system. On the other hand, there is almost no reward for the recipient in contract work in his social system which demands publish or perish. All too often those in the contract system end up being those who can't make it in the grant system.

To guide contract work requires the capability to guide the knowledge worker, a personnel quality not often available inhouse. Therefore if we cannot design the blueprint for problem solving because the ability (knowledge) is not there, we must buy both the blueprint and its implementation outside. What we need is a way to force the contract recipient to be relevant but not be directed in day-to-day operations, a kind of "middling autonomy." If we are to solve problems, we must set up a community of knowledge producers and decision makers which is interactive enough to serve to bridge the gap; fortunately, he said, there is a new generation of young social scientists which seems to have this quality.

Finally, the decision makers will have to face reality a little more than they have; we still move from a committee report to a billion dollar program. In moving from an idea to a behavior system, we must move through research, development, and testing stages. We allow five or six failures in engineering but exhibit little tolerance in social areas. The reality conditions under which we can take an idea in a social problem area and see if it works are: (1) that most attempts will fail, (2) that much debugging will be necessary, and (3) finally when we have a system that will work, we will need a communication mechanism geared to human consumption (not microfiche). He agreed that the knowledge maker must not be allowed to disappear into a private utopia, that he must consider the decision maker's world. But if we are serious about social guidance, we will have to find a more systematic way to buy knowledge that we are trying to find now.

Basically, society is less changeable than liberals believe. We tend to pass laws and expect change to occur. People are reluctant to change and more often than not, whatever you plug in, it will not have an effect. He cited poverty, smoking, and drinking, as examples of this and urged the decision maker to focus resources on problems that can be solved and then, only after high investment, careful R&D, careful planning, etc. are we likely to get anything out of it.

Q. Why should we do anything, if it will not work?

A. We are too ambitious; we should not expect to solve social problems quickly and we can't solve all of them at once. As a result, under pressure, we gesture instead of focussing our efforts. In the short run this enhances the belief that we are doing something, but leads only to disappointment in the longer term. Partly our problem is attracting adequate talent. As a consequence of the academic reward system, applied research is being done by the poorer people. It is true that the situation is changing in the universities and that a generation of young turks is beginning to bestir itself, but I'd say that 480 of 500 researches on a given topic are poor. Moreover the problem is compounded by the fact that talent drops off quickly in Washington. There is no major university in the Capital; intellectual resources and young workers are limited.

Q. What is the likelihood of putting together different disciplines to attack problems in education?

A. Etzioni was dubious of the advisability of piecing together different disciplines. What was missing was a whole tier of personnel and function, something akin to medicine or engineering. He referred the audience to Herb Ganz's idea of whole new worlds within society and suggested that new disciplines, like urbanology, are emerging in academia.

Q. Why do you think it is that we jump from idea to operational program?

A. It doesn't seem to be politically feasible to go through legislation the first time or reach the clients right away, it won't make it. However, it's extremely expensive to legislate first and patch up the program later. This is largely a result of "oversell" necessary to get it on the books in the first place.

Q. What about the increased social concern that seems to be rising today?

A. Our typical social response to these voices is to add another course to the curriculum. For example, when it became common knowledge that we were killing 200,000 people a year on our highways, we created driver education. Now more people than ever drive a car. We're currently experiencing concern over drug abuse. What are we doing? We're pumping funds into the creation of drug abuse curricula, that just may result in more drug usage. The citizen is not as stupid as we think and is not buying this approach. He is asking for a reallocative commitment to broad social questions in terms he can deal with and wants to be heard on priority questions, not in expert technical areas, but so far we have designed a decision-making system that excludes him because he is uninformed and will keep him uninformed.

Q. What institutional recommendations would you make? How do we use social science better?

A. Agencies must become interested in the values of society. We should split up the large departments, not consolidate them, so laymen can deal with less complex notions. We need more things like NIE, where the social sciences can be concentrated. More interaction between researchers and decision makers. And most important, more capability for long-term commitment, if we are to be serious about solving social problems.

Q. How can Congress listen to more outside experts?

A. My observation is that, under the press of time, Congress listens to partisan sources (lobbies), executive sources (too locked in to a particular Administration), and one or two key staff people (simply inadequate for the burden). What we need to do is to create new sources of information, perhaps data analysis units, an enlarged Library of Congress service, create an enlarged evaluation function in GAO, or something like Senator Mondale's Council of Social Advisors, although social scientists haven't been too supportive of the latter because it would give Congress more information to be more conservative.

Q. What about revenue sharing? What do you think of its prospects?

A. I'm not very optimistic about revenue sharing as it stands in the present bill, although we certainly need some way to get at the financial crisis. It is systematically caught up in the debate over whether funds are most effectively spent by the private or public sector. I think that our best social work is done by the not-for-profits, particularly research is best done by this third sector - by that I mean in the universities where talent and protection from political or profit pressure exists.

-- reported by Gary Hanna
(36 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY   INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "POLICY PRIORITIES AND THE CURRENT STATE OF AMERICAN EDUCATION"

MAY 17, 1971

DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND, JR.
U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Commissioner Marland referred to an article written by Samuel Halperin in Change Magazine, January 1971, and the admonitions contained in that article for him. Marland stated that he had tried to take Halperin's advice to:

1. Work for a better relationship between HEW and Office of Management and Budget,
2. Make staffing of his office of the highest priority,
3. Make effective use of research and development and,
4. Concentrate on getting new leadership into key positions.

Marland explained that 10 years ago the Office of Education budget stood at $600 million--while this year the Administration would be asking for $6.2 BILLION. The number of programs during that time has risen from 23 to approximately 107. Consequently, this has meant that greater expertise and more judicious administration is necessary to run the Office of Education. Despite the difficulty of managing these increasing programs the staff of OE has only doubled during the last ten years.

Marland highlighted the six major areas that the Office of Education was focussing on:

1. Disadvantaged Child - "We haven't yet found a way to reach him."
2. Integration - "In the past year the number of minority children attending majority white schools has increased from 18 percent to 63 percent in the 11 Southern States."
3. Handicapped - "Fewer than one-third of the handicapped are now getting aid."
4. Career Education - "Not all excellence resides in a degree from a liberal arts college." There should be a value placed in working with one's hands; vocational education could be contrasted with "meaningless general education". He contended that there was a link between the present type of high school education and drug problems.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

5. Management of OE programs.

6. Minorities in Higher Education - Must get more minorities in institutions of higher education.

Q - What is your position on a separate Department of Education?

A - In the past I was an ardent advocate of that proposal. I now agree with the Administration's reorganization plans for a Department of Human Resources.

Q - Do you have any hopes for Special Education Revenue Sharing?

A - Yes, perhaps because I do not know that much about Congress; it seems to me that they will have to "wobble right on this. This is a long overdue proposal." Overlapping of programs causes too much paper shuffling. Special revenue sharing merely tries to deal with that problem. We must stop "making priorities that appeal to both extremes" in this country. (He also appealed for general revenue sharing.)

Q - Don't you foresee urban education suffering under special revenue sharing because of the nonurban dominance in state legislatures and state politics

A - Not with the safeguards presently written into the legislation - aid for the disadvantaged and category A of Impact Aid will be passed through to the localities. I have confidence that states will be able to intelligently establish priorities as they do somewhat now. The State Advisory Councils will "wobble right". They are required to develop a plan and make that plan public.

Q - Specifically, how would Title VI apply to special revenue sharing funds? What happens to funds once they are commingled? What kind of monitoring of funds would take place?

A - There would be no commingling problem. Funds will simply be withheld if any discriminatory act is found where a Federal dollar is being spent. Continuing regulations will insure the proper use of funds. Advisory committees made up of majority poor will be established in districts that receive funds for the disadvantaged. Reviewing state plans is irrelevant now since they automatically get approved. If Office of Education people cooperate in making plans with State Advisory Councils it will be much more effective than OE merely trying to coerce state governments into accepting certain program priorities.

Q - Wouldn't it be better to do some grant consolidation or overall block grant approach?

A - That's what special revenue sharing will do.

Q - Where are the new ideas about higher education coming from, if at all?

A - Some from Carnegie, most from administrators and educators.

Q - What have you done to get women into high positions in the Office of Education?

A - We have tried. We just offered the position of Associate Commisssioner for Higher Education to a women and she turned it down.

Q - Despite all of the new programs submitted by the Administration to Congress the budgeting still reflects a lower commitment to these programs, why?

A - The total budget of the Office of Education increases in FY 1972 by 25 percent. There's an extra $200 million under special revenue sharing despite cuts in vocational education which came "before my time. We will try to increase those amounts, although presently we have little to show for those efforts. The States are oversubscribing to vocational education. Vocational education needs major reforms before we can ask for more money."

Q - What will the National Institute of Education do?

A - The field of educational research is relatively new and consequently it needs greater impetus. Only since '65 has it gained respectability. NIE would do 10 percent of its work in-house with the rest deployed around the country and abroad so as to create breakthroughs in educational research.

Q - Do you see the future acceptance of the 12-month school year?

A - There is little present support for it. It could increase "productivity" of the schools by 30 percent although I am still not sure if it is good to shorten the education process. A good economic and educational case must be made for it.

Q - What do you think of doing away with compulsory education?

A - I don't agree with the notion of compulsory education and think it should be replaced by voluntary education. At least we could develop "nonprison" schools so people will want to attend.

Q - Why have an National Institute for Higher Education and one for Education. Why not combine all of the funds and activities under NIE?

A - I could live with that, if necessary, but feel our present rationale for both is persuasive. There is one weakness--higher education wants it's own institute and would oppose such a combination.

Q - If the state advisory councils are predominantly poor will the federal government provide funds for them to get to meetings, get technical assistance, etc.?

A - There should be funds for district-wide councils, although not necessarily for transportation. I don't think it's necessary to put it in legislation

--reported by Ellen Sudow
(Attendance: 41 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* "THE COUNTERBUDGET"

June 23, 1971

Robert Benson, Director, National Urban Coalition's National Priorities Project, described The Counterbudget as an alternative national budget aimed at the "reordering of national priorities"--a need which heretofore had been dealt with only in rhetoric and abstract solutions. It was the product of a series of bargains, compromises and trade-offs reached by some 500-1000 people representing numerous groups and disparate interests, but with a general agreement on a set of principles. The major purposes of the undertaking were 1) to establish a framework by which the Urban Coalition could guide its activities and respond to the nation's needs and problems; 2) to determine the resource allocation that would allow for a frontal attack on these problems; and 3) to educate the public as to these possibilities. Its conclusion was that, assuming the three basic conditions of healthy economic growth, modest tax increases, and spending cuts in major items of overspending, particularly that of defense, it would be possible to reorder the nation's priorities and solve its problems without necessitating a vast increase in federal expenditures.

Benson stressed that the Counterbudget was not meant to be a comprehensive set of answers, nor an advocate of a particular program or set of views. There were, he said, a number of important factors which are necessarily involved but could not be dealt with in the context of the study, such as the need for better management, "national will", etc., but he was hopeful that their effort would lead to a more informed public and a better quality of public debate.

Doug Ross, Project Staff in Charge of Education, the National Urban Coalition, focused his comments on Chapter 6 of the Counterbudget, on Education, and in particular their recommendations for secondary education. Their objective in this chapter was to determine how to eliminate the disparities in group educational achievement and what the federal role should be to insure that 1) no person could leave the public schools without the basic capabilities necessary to enter the labor market, and, 2) that the public schools serve as a bridge for students to enter into higher education or the labor market.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Their major recommendation was to restructure Title I on an output basis, i.e., determining money distribution on the basis of nationally-administered achievement scores, instead of on the basis of income. In practical terms, this would mean an allocation of $300.00 for each child who is not making satisfactory progress in achieving basic levels in math and reading skills, with the federal government providing models from which every Title I school could develop a program to help its students gain the minimum level of proficiency. If a school failed to provide those basic skills even after the adoption of a model, the federal government could step in, and in the last analysis, go outside the school system and give money directly to the student if the system is unable to achieve these basic goals. In sum, Ross said, this change in Title I would mean an allocation of funds based on output, national standards and money goals, which would go to the student directly if all else were unsuccessful.

The general discussion began with an inquiry as to how the Counterbudget has been received by the press. Benson replied that it has generated a healthy amount of attention in the press and thoughtful consideration in the Congress. A participant pointed out that some of the Counterbudget's positions (e.g. on adult education) were actually "behind" education proposals being offered by the Congress, and Ross said that they were encouraged by this progress. The Counterbudget's recommendations on adult education spending, he stated, reflect a whole revision in manpower training objectives.

In reply to a question on the proposed transfer of funds to a student if the public system fails, Ross explained that there is a comparability system: it will cost the federal government more money if the money goes outside the school system, and the school will simply lose that amout of money. It is politically impossible to push equalization beyond a certain point, and they were therefore minimizing equalization of inputs and trying to push for equalization of outputs.

Q- Had the matter of government organization had been taken up in the development of the Counterbudget. Benson: the staff had a general revulsion against government involvement in delivery systems; while the government has been successful in certain areas, such as social security and some VA programs, the Counterbudget emphasizes a reallocation of cash and attempts to minimize the number of programs in which the federal government is delivering services. For example, they would do away with food stamps and move to income transferral, so that people could buy their own foodstuffs. Applying this approach to education, they support a National Institute for Education to centralize research. They did not support the establishment of a Department of Education (reasons unstated).

Q - Regarding the Title I changes and proposed $300/per child funding, how would you insure effectiveness, which depends not so much on money but on how it is spent? Ross: No one would be held accountable until the model programs are made available to the schools, i.e., until they are shown how to achieve the desired success. The answer lies in "Money and Models", and the Counterbudget proposes setting aside funding for such models, for example, $500 million in fiscal 1976 for educational research.

Ross emphasized that allocating money according to low test results would not serve to perpetuate low test results, as one participant feared, and explained that there would be a definite time limit established, based on experience gained through the models. In response to a comment that Title I already contained the necessary provisions for measurements, Ross said that they would not object to tightening up Title I and using that as a vehicle, but that Title I as it now exists lacks the incentives to succeed.

A participant criticized the Counterbudget's Title I change as being only terminology, since "allocation still seems to be based on input rather than quality of output and ignores the critical variable of quality of instruction in the classroom." Ross: The Counterbudget proposal creates an incentive to buy a willingness to change, for example, by identifying workable classroom situations for different kinds of students.

To the criticism that the Counterbudget fails to get to the roots of the problem and merely adds more money at the output without getting to the home, the environment and the society, Benson and Ross said that, to the contrary, this is the purpose of the whole Counterbudget. Their recommendations must be viewed at the broader level and it must be understood that the educational objectives it presents are not in isolation, but rather are in addition to its other recommendations, such as in areas as adequate nutrition, adequate basic income, and those other factors making for an improved environment. Although the Counterbudget is not enough in itself to change the environment of the home, etc., it can make it a lot more practicable, thus making it possible for a child to benefit from the proposed education changes. "If you tie federal money to a system of incentives which are geared to producing certain changes, rather than simply providing money for the existing system as we have done in the past, then you are moving toward a more viable system."

Asked how the achievement of the Counterbudget is being threatened by the observable tendency toward tax cuts and increases in the defense budget, Benson acknowledged that the Congress has not shown a readiness to implement drastic cuts in defense spending and said that until the public gets much more involved in this issue, it will continue to be a significant threat to achieving the Counterbudget's objectives. The tax cut issue may be the toughest battle of all, he stated, since there is no constituency pushing for tax increases.

Another participants pointed out that since the federal budget is only 20 percent of the GNP, the Counterbudget is working only with a "drop in the bucket", and asked what was being done about bringing corporate wealth into play, such as getting stockholders to vote in ways which will change investment patterns. Had any thought been given to influencing those large corporate holders on the Urban Coalition itself? Answer: If the "fat cats" were willing, you wouldn't need the Counterbudget!

Q - The speakers had directed themselves only to students; how would you deal with problems such as teachers and teachers' unions in making for educational change? Ross: With changes in federal revenues, there will be a natural effect on teachers, etc. It seemed more effective to go through the students and to provide indirect incentives, he said, rather than taking direct teachers' corrective measures.

The speakers' emphasis on elementary and secondary education was also noted, and they were asked how they felt about the federal role in higher education. They replied that they saw the most essential problems as being in elementary and secondary education, and that they could see less of a federal role in higher education, except in matters such as student aid to get students into higher education, and "helping universities with resources". The Counterbudget may seem truncated, they continued, but this is a refelection of the strong decisions which had to be made in its creation about societal pressures and about where the federal government can play the best role and provide the best incentives.

Asked if they found any good structures and good pay-offs in their evaluations of existing education programs, the answer included: the Teacher Corps; some programs for the handicapped, although these need expansion; support of the arts; and student aid, although increases are also necessary.

A questioner was troubled by their being "locked into the school system", particularly in early childhood education, and asked them to consider what could be done if that money were given to the mother, since the home, rather than the school, is the crucial variable. The speakers noted that the Counterbudget holds the public schools accountable and provides an "out" if the school system fails, but said that the suggestion was helpful.

(Doug Ross is working on a more detailed paper on pre-school, secondary and higher education; ESS hopes to distribute it when ready.

--reported by Toby E. Mayman
(46 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: WHO BENEFITS? WHO GOVERNS?"

Friday-Saturday, October 8-9, 1971

GUEST SPEAKERS: Joel S. Berke, Director, Educational Finance and Governance Program, Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation, and Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University; Alan K. Campbell, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School and Professor of Political Science, Syracuse University; Anthony M. Cresswell, Assistant Professor, School of Urban and Public Affairs, and Director, Education Center, Carnegie-Mellon University; Michael Kirst, Assistant Professor of Business and Educational Administration, Stanford University; Seymour Sacks, Professor of Economics, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University

To be "quick and dirty" about it, the conclusions seemed to be these: (I'll quote longer and fairer summations later on.)

1) Who benefits? The disadvantaged benefit from Title I, as they should, but other Federal money seems to be spread around fairly randomly. The bulk of all educational finance is done by the states, and at the state level the dice are loaded in favor of rural areas and then the suburbs. Federal money does not significantly reduce this bias--except Title I money--and there isn't enough of this to make a whole lot of difference.

2) Who governs? There isn't any sound information on what money goes where until somebody actually gets a Ford study together and sends graduate students out to the boonies to dust off the books. State and local government are a mess, and the politics of education is enshrouded in the pretense that education is non-political, and what with one thing and another it isn't terribly clear that anyone is actually governing.

The researchers, funded by The Ford Foundation, reported on educational finance and the effect of Federal money in five states: Texas, Massachusetts, New York, California and Michigan. (An overview of their work, "Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits?", has been published in Committee Print by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity.)

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The scholars' findings represent a scandal to which the California Supreme Court has addressed itself in the *Serrano* decision which overthrows the property tax base of California's educational finance system. A parallel finding has just been made in Minnesota. Perhaps the U.S. Supreme Court will, consequently, bring about total upheaval in state educational finance.

Following are the main findings of the group, and the body of the subject matter of the ESS seminar: (emphasis added)

> "First, *in the most urbanized areas of the nation we found a unique crisis in educational finance* caused by a general deterioration in their fiscal situation combined with higher demands and costs--for education and other public services--than exist in neighboring communities. *Yet the school districts that received the most Federal aid per pupil were not in urban but in rural areas. Within the metropolitan areas central cities received proportionately more total Federal assistance than their suburbs, but the amounts received were far too small to make up for the suburban advantage in local wealth and state assistance*. Patterns of individual programs, however, varied immensely and often defied consistent explanation. In a number of important cases, however, as in ESEA Titles II and III, Vocational Education, and NDEA Title III, major cities have received even less aid than should have been allotted to them in view of their proportion of the state's student population.
>
> "Second, *with regard to the relationship of Federal aid to district capacity to support education, we found that there was no important compensating effect*. While districts with lower income tended to get slightly more aid on the whole than those with higher income, there was no such compensatory relationship with assessed property valuation, the most common source of revenue for local school support.
>
> "Third, one important measure of educational need is the proportion of poor and minority group pupils in a district. *Here, because of the impact of Title I, we found that Federal aid is significantly related to educational need*. Districts with lower income and higher proportions of non-white pupils received more aid than those with lower proportions of such pupils. *Unfortunately, the magnitude of assistance was meager in proportion to the immensely costly task of education for the poor and culturally deprived*.
>
> "Fourth, *over the four-year period of our study, amounts of aid received by individual school districts varied markedly and erratically*. Furthermore, during the last year studied, almost half the districts in metropolitan areas reported an actual decrease in per pupil amounts of aid.
>
> "Fifth, although questions of program administration and design are a part of a later phase of this study, we did think it useful to comment on some outstanding problems at this point. *ESEA money, for example, has largely gone for a variety of special and ancillary programs and has not been used*

to improve the central portion of the curriculum presented to disadvantaged children. The failure to concentrate funds on the students most in need of compensatory education has frequently resulted in a superficial veneer of fragmented programs or new equipment, rather than in an integrated, high impact intervention to achieve major educational change. Dilution of the impact of Federal aid has also come about through the improper but widespread use of Title I as general aid for system-wide purposes.

"Sixth, and last, Federal aid is intended to provide strategically useful funds for educational purposes not otherwise receiving adequate support. Our study suggests, however, that the amounts of aid are simply too small in view of the problems that confront public education. At present, for the nation as a whole, Federal aid constitutes less than seven percent of public elementary and secondary school revenues. For the five industrialized states of our study (California, New York, Michigan, Massachusetts and Texas), the proportions ranged from a little over three percent in New York to 10 percent in Texas. In per pupil absolute terms, Federal aid averaged between $22 and $50 per pupil in those same states. Given our findings on the threatening fiscal crisis facing urban education, these amounts are patently insufficient to overcome the financial problems of the urban public schools."

Dean Alan Campbell

As a political scientist, "Scotty" Campbell considers the pretense of educators to non-political status to be pretty meaningless. People in education hold autonomy and professionalism as their values and the myth that education is separate from politics is a very effective myth used to achieve their ends.

The consequences of the myth of separation of education from politics are difficult to identify but they seem to include the following:

In finance: While separation of education from other services may have got more money for education in the past, the high visibility of school bond issues now works to the disadvantage of the schools. Eighty percent of new Michigan tax issues and 60% of new California school bond issues have been defeated in the last year, and over the past five years the rate of rejection of school bond issues has risen all over the country. The local revolt against school bond issues is the most apparent part of the tax revolt now on in the country, Campbell says.

In local politics: the myth of the separation of education from politics results in the fact that "conflict over education has no sustaining structure." There is intermittent crisis in education, drives for more funding, uproar over sex and literature, but never any real debate over well-understood issues.

Looking at education across whole states Campbell finds that cities spend more of their funds on non-educational services--police, fire protection, graft, etc.--than do the suburbs, and further, the cities have much higher costs for land, building and other educational costs. Intergovernmental aid--most of which is from states to local units of government--could offset these differences in costs and need, but it doesn't. State aid formulas generally do not consider educational need and do not consider the costs of density in the cities. Nor do the formulas consider the different effects of given aid in different areas: in cities educational aid tends not to be "additive," dollars transferred by states to cities being used to shift city taxes into other municipal expenditures. In the suburbs, by contrast, where there is not such great competition for every dollar among competing municipal services, a dollar from the state tends more strongly to be a dollar added to educational expenditures, rather than a dollar partially diverted into other services or tax reductions.

This marked lack of attention to real effects in educational finance is a function of the decision-making system at the state level: legislatures and state departments of education tend to be rurally oriented, while people in education, administrators and state education bureaucracies tend to relate to constituencies of people like themselves, teachers, supervisors and non-political good government types. It is only recently that these comfortable old ways are going and new coalitions are starting now to appear.

Campbell sees the possibility of four stages in the development of a state education system:

One, the most primitive one is without lobbies or constituencies, and state legislatures relate directly and without pressure to local education authorities. The natural courses of politics make this give way to stage

Two, where teachers, supervisors, PTA's and the like coalesce. At this stage, however, they all see themselves as being in favor of education, and so there is not a great deal of conflict between groups.

At the third stage of evolution conflict erupts between groups. Rural legislators are confronted by urban constituencies who demand fair and full funding for city schools. Angry parents start going to court to overthrow the local property tax financing of education, and so on. Most of the industrial states are at this stage of evolution now.

The fourth stage of evolution is to be glimpsed in the Illinois school system where there is a major attempt to get all constituencies together in a Schools Problems Committee to solve problems in a professional and straightforward way.

Campbell favors state education operations at this fourth level, and suggests that with evolution to this stage will come full state funding of education, decentralized school districts, and the creation of executive departments of education at the state level. Such an evolution would be aided by enlarged Federal aid with focussed guidelines.

(The trouble with all evolutionists, of course, is that they tend to look in the past for the missing link, without considering the possibility that we are it; they assume that all evolution leads up to exactly the most interesting or useful specimen to be found around right now. Thus Campbell's suggestion that there are four stages of evolution, the crowning glory of which is the Illinois Schools Problems Committee, might leave a little something more to be said. But still, it's good political science analysis. -- D.L-J.)

Joel Berke

As the main spokesman, Professor Berke stated most of the findings quoted above as prologue. He emphasized that there is gross inequality in the amount of money getting to the schools, with city schools, schools with children from poor families, and schools with minority group enrollments getting the short end of it. Nevertheless, he repeatedly emphasized equalization of funding is not the end he desires. Rather, fair funding in education means funding which puts the most money into the schools that need it most.

Queried: "What is there to show that expenditure of money is actually connected to educational results? Surely more money doesn't necessarily mean better education." To which Campbell replied "Even if there isn't yet a provable connection, wouldn't it be nice if money went to the people who need it most?"

Campbell and Berke both were sure that one would see genuine results from incremental spending on disadvantaged kids, if the increment were of the order of 25 to 50 percent above background spending for all students. $400 to $500 per student is the sort of figure they had in mind, and while they didn't have any figure for the total cost of such a program to the entire country, they did point out that simple "leveling upward" the spending per student in New York to the level of the 80th percentile in per student expenditures, $1124 per student, would cost about $600 million. The base cost of New York's elementary and secondary education at present is roughly $4.4 billion, so this represents an increase in overall expenditures of roughly 12 percent.

Questions around this subject of equity and possibility kept arising throughout the weekend in various ways. One participant started a couple of good discussions in index theory and a number of statistically minded people referred to ways the Bureau of Labor Statistics and others concoct indexes of need, normality and necessity. There was a good deal of suggestion that such indexes for education ought to be developed.

By contrast, some suggested that discrimination in favor of school systems with greater needs is likely to cause a great deal of trouble, and wouldn't it be easier, after all, to simply put one's effort into the delegitimization of credentials so that poor people wouldn't need schooling quite so much?

44

(Delegitimization of credentials is a live issue since Ivan Illich and the Grey vs. Duke Power Company decision, which held that a high school equivalency examination could not constitutionally be used to bar a man from a job as a senior maintenance man. Tests of ability have to reflect needs of the job if they are to be constitutional in their discrimination, the Supreme Court in effect held.

(This, reading moral for constitutional, is what I think Ivan Illich believes to be true, and sensible men and women must agree. You can no more morally keep a man from a civil service job in garbage collection for lack of a high school diploma than you can keep a physicist off the whizzatron for not being a Knight of the Bath. To apply academic standards to career decisions is as stupid and shortsighted as it would be to pick Supreme Court Justices by their sign of the Zodiac.

(Mixing up academic credentialing with the testing of technical skills which a society needs is like confusing law with justice, medicine with health and schooling with education. It is one of those errors which can doom a civilization and the Illich crowd have done a good thing in making it a public issue.

(But a horrifying undercurrent for me, of the educational finance seminar was that a number of people were suggesting that the way to counter manifest injustice in our funding of education and demonstrated inequality in the educational achievement of various social classes and racial groups is to discourage the poor and the black from thinking that a Harvard degree is really worth having.

(This is one of those Greening-of-America kind of suggestions which crystallize the moral bankruptcy of too many supposed imaginative thinkers in this country: "Well," says the pedigreed policy maker or Congressional aide, "these people are demanding good schools. Let's just tell them that we don't think that much of the high school diploma, and then the problem will lessen somewhat." -- D.L-J.)

Michael Kirst

Kirst reviewed the variety of decision-making mechanisms in the states and some of the effects of these differences on the way money is spent.

1) There are vast differences in the ways state governments operate in education. In California, for instance, during the Rafferty years, the State legislature set up advisory committees on various aspects of education so that it could legislate almost minutely about the way money was to be spent. This did not hinder Wilson Riles who, for instance, has taken the unusual step of allocating no Title I money to all the junior high and high schools, so that it can all go to the elementary schools.

In Texas, by contrast, the State Superintendent, J. W. Edgar, has held his appointive office since 1948 and the State legislature has neither knowledge nor interest concerning the ways money is divided among the schools by Edgar's department.

In Michigan alone there is a state plan for the spending of Federal education money, and Michigan programs its priorities to direct Federal money to the cities, the desolate north of the state, to poor rural areas and to schools with minority enrollments.

The opposite extreme in state planning for use of Federal money is represented by Massachusetts and the New England states where there is a "religion of localism" and state education authorities are very weak.

2) Thus there is no generalization possible about the formulas and channels through which Federal money flows down to local authorities. It is fair to comment that vocational education money is largely chanelled through state "grooves" and is thus inequitably spent.

3) The Federal government at present has neither the sanctions nor the incentives with which to move local priorities in spending. Turnover in personnel in the Office of Education is such that no set of priorities is likely to last long. Each new generation of OE administrators wants to make its own mark and the J. W. Edgars of the world just watch them come and go. In Kirst's opinion the White House and Office of Management and Budget are out of contact with the realities of education in the field and Congressional people just don't look at what's happening out there.

4) The ineffectuality of the Office of Education in affecting the way state and local money is spent has been heightened by the fact that OE has had to get new programs running rapidly, and the pressure has been to get the money out. If OE had enforced guidelines, in fact, Congress would probably have already eliminated categorical programs and mandated block grants.

5) The fact that school authorities operate on "multi-pocket funding," going to a number of sources for funds for any given program and commingling funds means that the guidelines on any given program have a highly diluted effect on the operating programs in effect at the local level.

Anthony Cresswell

Cresswell gave an idea of the administrative mare's nest that lies behind these generalizations with his brief overview of the New York State system. He started with a horror story his investigators came about when they were in Albany tracing the flow of pieces of paper which goes on in administering grant money. Looking at the Title I funding process he found that the State education authority gave out one quarter of the money an authority asked for under Title I just because they filed a request -- if the authority was outside New York City. If, however, it was a New York City application, it was rerouted through a subloop of the system for "further examination" before even getting this first quarter. Title I funding formulas are open to "professional discretion" and this is what the professionals presumably thought appropriate.

Such decisions are made within a very small part of the state bureaucracy which has control over a very large proportion of the Federal money. The men who make such decisions tend to hold professionalism as a high value, to share power and discretion collectively, to avoid "the politics of special interests," to avoid conflict and seek consensus and to rely on expertise in making decisions.

It is state policy to hire state administrators from the ranks of teachers and administrators, and it comes about that most of them studied for their higher qualifications at either New York University or Teachers College of Columbia.

The tendency of the bureaucracy is to try to keep administrative decisions from becoming the stuff of political debate. Cresswell told a story of one time when that failed to occur. There are two main criteria for judging the poverty of an area: census data and AFDC cases. In New York the original formula for dividing Title I funds rested half on census data and half on AFDC figures, but over the years the bureaucracy changed this formula until it rested 90 percent on AFDC and only 10 percent on census.

One day the majority leader in the state House said that he thought the formula ought to rest 100 percent on AFDC figures. Such gesture by anyone else could have been ignored, but after all it was the majority leader. The bureaucrats conferred. A plan was concocted to save face all around. In the House a bill was introduced to do what the majority leader wanted. On the day it was to pass busloads of walfare mothers, good government people and the like came up to Albany to sit in the gallery and watch. The bill passed; they were glad and went home.

As prearranged and expected, a hearing was never held on the bill in the state Senate, and it died. Two years later, however, the bureaucracy adopted the 100 percent AFDC formula.

Regarding New York City itself, except for summer school funding, vocational education money and research grants, all Federal money is negotiable with the UFT. The UFT is in favor of a program called MES: More Effective Schools. MES has been financed out of Title I every year lately, except one, when a study showed that it didn't actually improve education. For the succeeding year other funds had to be used to avoid the appearance of explicit banditry.

What is MES? It is smaller classes. More money for teachers to take more non-teaching "preparation periods." It is extra pay for teachers to stay on after school for meetings, counselling or self preparation. Naturally, the UFT likes More Effective Schools.

This situation was a fertile field for conflict with the development of the community school boards. They wanted control over their quota of Federal funds, while the UFT resisted. This, then, forced legislative intervention, and the legislature settled on a system whereby one third of Federal funding would be available to the community school boards for their ends, while two thirds would continue to be negotiable at the bargaining table.

Cresswell's view was that evaluation of project effectiveness, required by Federal law, is somewhat compromised when people evaluating things like More Effective Schools come from the same groups or milieu as those conducting the project. He suggested that Federal decision makers ought to be somewhat more canny about watching for this kind of thing and that at the same time they ought to be concerned about whether negotiations with the UFT were more powerful than the Federal government in deciding how Federal money is to be spent.

Cresswell also believes that there should be much more Federal attention paid to where money goes to, and much less paid to writing guidelines about how it is to be spent when it gets there. "State and local people don't feel an overwhelming need for Federal technical assistance."

Discussion Period

The discussion period which follows is depressing to report, though not because of its dullness or lack of intelligency. It was lively, bright and informed. What is depressing is that it covered so damn much ground.

A participant said high state aid does not over the whole country correlate with quality in education, because the bulk of the high state aid states are in the south, where states geared up the systems after the Civil War. There was a lively and complicated discussion of just what does correlate with quality of education....without conclusions.

There was some discussion of the phenomenon of great growth of education outside the areas subject to the Office of Education and outside the regular schools. Model Cities projects, preschool child development, Children's Television Workshop, Labor Department retraining programs. Some thought this was a Congressional strategy for getting around either OE or the state and local education authorities. Others thought it just an event of our times.

A number of agile minds were brought to the conundrum "if you give money to schools on the basis of demonstrated need, don't you tend to reward lack of achievement."

It was pointed out that Michael Kirst's belief that the Federal government had neither the sanctions nor the incentives to affect local and state priorities seemed to conflict with a remark Alan Campbell had made, "educational finance is so tight you can buy states and localities pretty cheap." The far ranging debate on this paradox illustrated the need for clearer paradigms of what "leverage" is all about.

This writer expressed some annoyance at the fact that a study like the Syracuse-directed one had to be such a "big deal": "If Jersey Standard can tell how many gallons of gas it is selling per square foot of gas station and per dollar's worth of investment, why can't OE administrators get information about suburban-urban bias in education spending by dialing it up from a data bank?" My view was supported by others calling for decent management information systems. All except one man from OE: he said Jersey Standard could do no such thing.

Seymour Sacks

Seymour Sacks, an economist, had been pretty quiet during most of the sessions, perking up now and then to throw a fact into the discussion. Sample: the cost of pensions for teachers in New York is $250 per student per year!

Dr. Sacks discussed the differences, anomalies, mysteries, gaps, foolishnesses and historical quirks which make it impossible for anyone at present to get a clear view of who is spending money where and on what in education. I can only list the bits and pieces I caught in my notes and refer all further enquiries to Dr. Sacks:

*There are fifty different state accounting systems, and USOE attempts at uniform accounting are foiled by state laws.

*Some states fund some expenses which other states pay on a current basis.

*There are legal fictions in state accounts: California, for instance, calls Federal money "Federal" at some times of year and "state" at other times of the year.

*There is no single clear notion of just what is a school district. Some school districts are dependent districts within other districts, and states might have both kinds.

*There is no hope for keeping track of the five thousand plus school districts in Nebraska.

*Some school accounts include non-educational expenditures.

*Many educational expenditures do not go through school districts.

*Some money just disappears at the local level. While the Federal books can be reconciled, books for the same expenditures at lower levels just don't add up. "Yeah, sure you can find something if you want to put a tracer on it. Except when it goes through HUD. Then you won't even find it with a tracer."

*How do you count the number of kids? In summer time you don't know how many there are or where they are. School starts at different times in different places. Kids drop out and kids drop in. Kids transfer into and out of parochial schools, etc.

*How do you measure enrollment? What about kids who come in on Saturday?

*The best numbers on educational finance are those turned up by the Census Bureau on years ending in "2" and "7," but these figures commingle state and Federal money.

*There are many local policy anomalies. Comparisons might be messed up when you find California high schools getting $0 in Title I, but this is because the money has been transferred over to the elementary schools.

*A lot of local people make up their figures differently for different reasons. They'll tell one person one thing, another person another.

*Accounting manuals are overburdened with detail. For every expenditure you've got a receipt, but nobody is paying any attention to revenue.

*Information on pension funds is largely missing. Comparability between expenditures is difficult because different systems have different kinds of pension schemes.

*Different systems account for debt service in different ways. In some places it is a local responsibility, so that Syracuse is spending 110 percent of its local revenue on debt service, making up part of it out of state grants. Elsewhere it is somebody else's cost on the books.

*Accounting systems are generally made up to keep people from stealing, so to speak. There is a virtual absence of accounting systems designed to produce policy relevant numbers.

Reported by David Lloyd-Jones

(57 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "THE CONGRESS AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY"

Friday, November 19, 1971

THE HON. LLOYD MEEDS
(Democrat, Second District of Washington)
U.S. House of Representatives

Representative Meeds serves on the General Education, Select Education, and Select Labor Subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Among his legislative accomplishments since coming to Congress in 1965 was his sponsorship of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

Mr. Meeds said that most Members of Congress have minimal experience with education programs when they first join the Committee on Education and Labor but that they appreciate the critical nature of education and are motivated to learn as much as possible. Meeds cited his own experience of having the Elementary and Secondary Education Act before the Committee during his first session in Congress with the presidency of the Madison High School PTA as his only non-student background in the field of education.

The Congress gathers ideas, Meeds said, from several general sources. Committee Members learn by studying education services provided but, just as importantly, from the omission of needed services. Such omissions, for example, were behind the Congressionally-initiated Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which received imputs from Administration and private sources and, in turn, prompted a beneficial redistribution of funds at the state level.

The education community, particularly the lobbying organizations, constitute a second source of assistance. The Administration in power is a third. As a source of information and political support the Administration can be of invaluable assistance to the passage of legislation or can present a significant barrier to passage by its opposition. Usually, major legislation needs Administration support and any Congress should do everything possible to gain such support. Meeds cited the example of the Drug Abuse Education Act passed in 1969. The Administration wanted drug education in the hands of the health experts but the will of the Committee prevailed. The final bill was good enough to be signed by the President and the Drug Abuse Education Program is now being implemented by the Administration.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Even after a program with apparent merit has been passed by the Congress and signed by the President there may be several barriers to effective implementation. The first problem is possible Administration reluctance to request and spend appropriations for the program. A second problem can be a cut in funds by the appropriations committees in the Congress. A third potential difficulty, admitted Meeds, is that the authorizing committee may write grandiose programs without sufficient thought to the resources available in the political process.

The ensuing question-and-answer session centered on the subject areas brought up by Meeds in his opening remarks and on some current issues in education approaches and legislation.

Rep. Meeds was asked about the validity of committee hearings. Are the Members really gathering information during hearings or are the decisions made behind the scenes?

Meeds answered that both situations exist at different times. For instance, on the National Institute for Education proposal the Members had no preconceived ideas and had to educate themselves. Testimony weighed heavily in all considerations. In other instances, there is legislation that a committee chairman or other powerful Member wants passed. If it is not major legislation, it may well pass with a few supportive witnesses "for show."

Another question concerned inter-committee communication. Do appropriations committee and authorization committee chairman work together in developing legislation?

Meeds said that there is generally much jealousy and a lack of cooperation between committees. The Chairman and the House Appropriations Committee tend to remain strictly removed from authorizing deliberations. There may be some informal communications between committees, but more cooperation is needed. He cited one successful example of cooperation concerning the Child Development bill. Representative Brademas talked extensively with Representative Wilbur Mills, whose Ways and Means Committee is considering child care provisions in H.R. 1, to define each committee's area of concern in the field of child care and development.

How does the Administration assist the Congress? Meeds cited five specific contributions that the Administration in power can make to the passage of legislation. First, the Administration can help politically. Not only can the Administration influence the votes of its own party, but it can assist in such important procedural necessities as obtaining a quorum for committee and subcommittee meetings.

Secondly, the Administration provides information. Major bills generally start "downtown." In such cases, the initial drafting and supporting information is provided by the Administration.

The Administration can help or hurt a bill with testimony. The testimony can build a case for or against legislation and alerts the members of their party to the Administration position.

The Administration can also act as an important communications link between members of the two Congressional bodies.

Finally, the Administration can make a decisive contribution if the President will sign legislation into law.

Rep. Meeds was asked if major legislation still can be passed if it is not initiated by the Administration. Meeds said that such legislation is sometimes passed with predominatly Congressional initiative. He listed the Vocational Education Act of 1968, the Education of the Handicapped Act, and the Child Development bill as examples of Congressionally-initiated legislation.

Rep. Meeds was asked how much attention is paid by the Education and Labor Committee to groups other than education groups, business and labor,for example.

He replied that business groups once commanded much attention. However, many Members began to feel that business was only interested in what education could offer specifically for the needs of a particular business or industry. Meeds said that he personally utilizes informal contacts with friends and constituents in the business community.

Labor, said Meeds, is more influential in deliberations on education policy. The influence of Labor results largely from the regular appearance of the AFL-CIO before the Education and Labor Committee to testify on the full range of education proposals.

Another inquiry concerned Rep. Meeds' opinion of state capabilities and the role of the states in education. Meeds said that state capabilities vary widely and must be judged on a state-by-state basis. For this reason, it is difficult to apply anything uniformly to all states.

Meeds was asked his analysis of the source of pressure for innovation and reform in education and if such reform can be implemented in the field. He believes that reform can be implemented in the field because the main impetus for reform is coming from the field. The Congress has been lax in waiting for problems to become acute before recognizing them. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has not been the panacea that Congress expected. The approach is too narrow. Meeds now favors a basic program of general aid with special targeting on low-income and minority students.

Meeds said that while some innovation is good, a complete overhaul of the present system, such as a voucher plan, would be detrimental. When asked if quick financial solutions might unfortunately drown out the debate over the quality of education, he replied, "Money is the mother's milk of education."

Rep. Meeds was asked what considerations resulted in the adoption of the National Institute of Education and the rejection of the National Foundation for Higher Education. He cited two probable causes. First, many Members considered the role of the two entities to be dublicatory. Secondly, the enthusiasm of the subcommittee chairmen considering the respective bills varied greatly. There was no National Foundation counterpart for the enthusiasm of Mr. Brademas for the NIE.

--reported by David Groton
(attendance: 65 persons

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "EDUCATION: A VIEW FROM THE STATES"

Monday evening, December 13, 1971

Speaker: The Honorable Charles F. Kurfess,
Speaker, Ohio House of Representatives

Speaker Kurfess has served in the State Legislature for 15 years. An attorney, he claims no special expertise in education. To put his remark in context, he noted that:

1. The Legislature has very little staff assistance. What is available is part-time and layman in nature. Legislators believe they make decisions, but they are really made by the State administrators and staff and generally accepted by the legislators.

2. Up until December 10, 1971, Ohio did not have a State income tax and thus had serious revenue problems. Half of the new income tax revenues are earmarked for education and will provide an estimated $400 million annually for elementary and secondary education. Changes in the State aid formula will be required--probably will go to a per pupil basis.

3. Property taxes which currently finance education cause many local problems. In many cases, the school district has too small a tax base. A State-wide property tax is needed for financial viability. Property taxes are very unpopular. They are levied twice a year and are too visible to voters.

Against this context, Mr. Kurfess indicated that the legislators had the following views of education and educators in Ohio:

1. Education was in a rut. Past practices were being perpetuated and there was too little innovation.

2. A change was needed in the measures of success of school programs. In the past, success was measured by the achievements of the best high school graduates. A better current measure would be an appraisal, on a long-term basis, of what happens to junior high school students, e.g. how well they do in secondary school, post-secondary schools, employment, etc.

This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

3. Schools reflect the attitudes of the communities in which they are located. Hence creating changes in schools requires addressing related changes in community attitudes.

4. Inner-city education problems are very severe. Children on ADC rolls (Aid to Dependent Children) have the most severe education problems and hence, special State funds for such children have been provided.

5. Seventy of the school districts in Ohio are essentially rural and are not benefitting sufficiently from the State aid program. In general, rural social problems are as critical as inner-city problems. There are, for example, more sub-standard housing units in rural areas than in urban areas.

6. There is a great deal of mobility in the school population which makes educational planning difficult.

7. Equitable distribution of education dollars is a complex problem. It does not necessarily promote equal quality. This is much more dependent on the quality of teachers, the location of the school, skills of administrators, etc.

8. A number of local schools may have to close early due to dollars shortages where the taxpayers voted against increased tax levies.

9. Legislators feel that they must rely too heavily on the State Department of Education for information about education programs. Educators do not "level" with the Legislature and do not confine themselves to objective educational judgments. Instead, they try to make political judgments (about what will sell).

10. Higher education in Ohio is run by a Board of Regents whose role is not clear. It tends to act as a lobby for higher education interests instead of interpreters and implementers of administration policy. The Legislature would prefer the Regents to act as advisors on higher education matters.

11. Public opinion is formed by many little things, not influenced solely by the big issues. This makes reaction to taxes difficult to anticipate in advance.

12. State education role in contrast to the local education role in Ohio is not clear. As State aid increases, however, the State is likely to exert a stronger influence.

13. The attitude of the Legislature is becoming increasingly critical with respect to:

a) The need to measure results and show what the State is getting for its dollar.

b) Cost increases for educational programs

c) Effectiveness of teaching programs

14. The Legislature will formulate educational judgements whether based on information or not and whether sound or not.

15. It is clear that legislative attitudes are not being correctly interpreted by the Chief State School Officers. This can harm educational programs.

Following are the highlights of the question and answer period:

Q - To what extent does the Federal initiative influence the State Legislature?

A - We are more influenced by the State Department of Education.

Q - Is there a lessening of voter interest at the local level because of increasing State and Federal involvement in education?

A - Not at all. There is greater interest as indicated by the rejection of tax levies until proposed changes are demonstrated as successful.

Q - Commissioner Marland has indicated that the Federal share of the education dollar should increase from the current 7 percent to 25 percent in the next five years to help resolve the financial crisis. Do you agree?

A - It would be desirable because of limited State tax base, but it should not have too many strings attached.

Q - Would a Federal increase give added power to SEA's at expense of State Legislatures?

A - The Legislature would not be unduly concerned so long as it is kept aware of what is happening.

Q - Are the SEAs likely to move toward direct responsibility for education and the LEAs lose power as a result of financing shifts?

A - This would depend on whether the State tax levy would substitute for a local levy or whether it would supplement a local levy.

Q - How do you feel about full State funding for education?

A - This is inevitable, at least in Ohio.

Q - Why is educational performance not linked to the State allocation formula?

A - Pupils should not be penalized for poor performance. Poorest performers may need more help rather than less.

Q - If Educational Revenue Sharing is enacted, would the State agencies be capable of administering it?

A - Yes, in Ohio, but the Legislature will be looking over the State Department's shoulder. However, we favor a tax credit rather than revenue sharing. (Federal income tax credits would be allowed as a percentage of State-levied income taxes.)

Q - The private colleges in Ohio seem to be in financial jeopardy. How does the State Legislature feel about this?

A - The Legislature's position is to help the colleges through grants to students rather than directly.

Q - What is the Ohio Legislature's raction to the Serrano decision in California?

A - The Legislature does not intend to wait for court action in Ohio, but will move in advance of the courts.

Q - What is the likely reaction of wealthy school districts to Statewide funding for education?

A - They are not likely to be happy, but local supplements would be permitted.

Q - What is the Ohio position on public aid to private schools?

A - Ohio now gives a $90 per pupil grant to parents channeled through the LEAs. In effect, this is public aid to the private schools.

Q - What is the Ohio policy on the school busing issue?

A - Ohio has not had to face the problem and has not stated a policy.

Q - With respect to Career Education, should the schools take on a placement as well as a training function?

A - Don't know, but there should be a close link between career training and available jobs or career education will just lead to frustration.

Q - How does the Legislature view Ohio's version of the Yale tuition plan (students repay loans as percentage of later income)?

A - This so-called Gilligan Plan hasn't been given any serious consideration.

--reported by Bert Mogin
(34 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

"EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"THE WHITE ETHNIC AMERICANS"

MSGR. GENO BARONI
Director, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs,
The Catholic University of America

Tuesday, February 1, 1972

Msgr. Baroni, as he spoke, drew a diagram of American society--a circle divided by two horizontal lines into three sections. At the top was a narrow slice representing the nation's elite, and at the bottom was a narrow slice representing Blacks and economically disadvantaged people. In the middle were the "middle Americans," the "ethnics," the focus of the evening's discussion.

One of Baroni's central themes was the alienation of this middle group. They are economically anxious because as members of the $5,000 to $12,000 family income group, they know that they are not "making it." While they can barely make ends meet, they resent government programs to assist those with less money than they--not so much because they begrudge the help to those less fortunate, but because they feel that they have the same problems themselves.

They also experience social and cultural anxiety. These parents, according to Baroni, are the Willie Lomans of the world--they are afraid to send their children to college or even into the Armed Services because they fear that when their children return, they will no longer share their parent's beliefs and value systems. Yet, paradoxically perhaps, these people lack a sense of identity; they don't know who they are. Education has aimed at the proverbial melting pot, Americanization, the putting down of the immigrant, ethnic culture, Baroni says. Children are taught to get away to some other place where they can "make it," but when as young adults they succeed in doing this, they find that they are not at home in Levittown either, and in fact no longer fit in anywhere. Baroni used as an example his sister's home--full of plastic, including plastic flowers--and his Italian mother's home--much poorer but at least with real flowers. He maintains that his mother, despite her broken English, had a better sense of cultural identification.

---

* This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Baroni illustrated his theme of cultural alienation with such statements as:

> "If you want to know where American cities are going, Newark is there first."
> "It has never been kosher to admit ethnic plurality, but we will see a strong persistence of ethnic identity in behavior."
> "America is undergoing a fantastic identity crisis. The cultural explosion will be in middle America--economically, socially, politically and culturally.
> "No important question can be decided without middle America.
> "Youngstown doesn't read the Washington Post or the New Republic, or much of anything. It watches TV--Woodstock, documentaries, peace demonstrations and that kind of stuff and can't understand what these people at the top are trying to do.
> (On culture): "Middle America hasn't produced anything since Studs Lonigan.
> "Many see the middle American as part of the problem, but maybe he is part of the solution."

The frictions and alienation between the ethnic middle Americans and ghetto Blacks and other groups can only be alleviated if you give people a stronger sense of identity--a feeling of who they are, where they came from, what is valuable in their culture. Some, like George Wallace, attempt to play on ethnic differences by heightening anxiety and frustration. Baroni sees ethnic differences as valuable and instrumental in alleviating inter-cultural frictions. He maintains that, "to the degree that people develop a sense of identity, to that degree they are free to participate." Using ethnic identification as a building block enables groups to feel secure enough in their own right to begin to bridge the chasm to work with other groups.

Schools, in Baroni's estimation, have worked against the development of ethnic identity. He characterizes the educational system as one that "teaches us to be intellectual--to have no feelings." Education has stressed Americanization, and deemphasized ethnic cultural values. It avoids, rather than confronts, the ethnic issue. "I have yet to see the school program that deals with the black/white factor," Baroni stated.

Working class ethnics, when discussing racial and social-economic differences, express anxiety. Their parents came to the U.S. recently and they are conscious of having no stake. This also means they do not share the "Presbyterian and Episcopalian guilt" regarding slavery. Wallace caters to and whets their anxiety.

Baroni stresses that despite this anxiety and resentment between ethnics, blacks and browns, there are many convergent issues affecting all the groups--drugs, crime, housing, economics, freeways, education. But unless the groups can join forces, the necessary support for needed programs relating to these convergent issues will never develop. On those rare occasions when meetings between ethnics and blacks occur, the usual pattern is for members of different groups to split up into their own caucuses. When they rejoin, they are surprised to find that separately, they have arrived at very similar goals, demands and ambitions. Having discovered so much in common, they can then at least begin to work together toward action on convergent areas.

Q - How could ethnicity be cranked into Office of Education programs?

A - Emphasis on ethnic studies, ethnic history and ethnic culture, rather than through the current leveling approach to pluralism. Teacher training institutes and workshops on ethnic culture would be particularly valuable.

Q - With so much intermarriage between groups, how can an ethnic be identified or how can he identify himself?

A - People may not be consciously ethnic, but they will still be behaviorally ethnic. This is an area that needs research.

Q - Congressman Pucinski has suggested that Polish students as well as blacks and whites be counted for purposes of desegregation and allocating funds. What do you think of that?

A - This is just a reaction. We're in trouble if we respond.

--reported by Martha Phillips
(attendance: 65 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"COORDINATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS: IS IT REALLY POSSIBLE?"

Tuesday, February 8, 1972

ESS hosted a dinner/discussion meeting of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) on February 8, 1972. Our panelists were: William F. Gaul, Associate General Counsel of the House Committee on Education and Labor; Emerson Elliott, Deputy Chief of the Human Resources Programs Division in the Office of Management and Budget; and Charles Kidd, Executive Secretary of the Association of American Universities. Commissioner of Education and Chairman of FICE, Sidney P. Marland, and 35 representatives from 16 Federal agencies and the Congress were present.

Dr. Kidd described various types and levels of coordination pertaining to education and the Federal Government. The relationship between Federal and non-Federal entities, he stated, can be coordinated only on a broad scale. Within the Federal Government, he described the relationship between Federal educational programs and other Federal programs which impact on education, such as Federally-funded research. He also pointed to the need for relationships between programs with different functions, such as student aid, construction grants, and for coordination among agencies which administer similar support programs such as student support. He emphasized the need for rational planning which includes, for example, estimates of future trained manpower requirements which would be generated if the President's education, health and other goals are to be met.

Emerson Elliott stated that there are some 29 different Federal agencies involved in education with $15.7 billion in estimated outlays for education planned for FY 1973. Of that amount, one-third will come from the Office of Education and one-fifth from other agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Mr. Elliott estimated that approximately 60 percent of Federal funds for education is categorized under programs for direct aid to educational institutions or individuals. These programs consist principally of those administered by the Office of Education, VA benefits, and payments to students who are children of deceased or disabled social security beneficiaries. Approximately 40 percent of Federal support funds are used for Federal purchasing and support of educational services from institutions as a means of meeting national purposes. Referring to the Executive order which created FICE, Mr. Elliott indicated that one of the most useful tasks which FICE could perform would be to establish networks of individuals who have related programmatic knowledge and interest and to create ad hoc groups to provide needed analysis of pressing educational issues. Bringing people together with like interests to share information and to jointly fund projects and review common problems would also be helpful.

William Gaul described some of the difficulties encountered in coordination between the legislative and executive branches. Strengthening communications between the legislative and executive branches would be beneficial to both groups in the process; program administrators' understanding of legislative intent for various educational programs would be enhanced. He suggested the creation of a central clearinghouse of information on all Federal education programs as one means of strengthening coordination. He emphasized the need for a continuing review of Federal education programs by a continuing group. A multiplicity of agencies and programs is not necessarily a bad thing, but what is needed is a common language. The central clearinghouse of information suggested would go a long way to alleviate problems of communication not only for those in Government but also for those involved in educational activities outside the Government. He brought attention to the fact that there exists no central office which can, on a continuing basis, qualitatively and quantitatively measure the impact of Federally-funded programs on institutions or individuals. The collection and cataloging of educational data must be strengthened.

Commissioner of Education Marland commented on the panel discussion and some current issues receiving consideration by FICE. He compared the task of maintaining the balance between legislative intent on one hand and leadership for change on the other to walking on a tightrope. Educators must rise above partisanship in meeting the needs of the educational community. Those involved with Federal educational activities must above all trust each other across departmental and branch lines if coordination is to be effective. Dr. Marland recognized the increasing enthusiasm with which the FICE members are volunteering their time and effort to deal with major issues and problems. FICE activities have now broadened considerably beyond higher education into new areas such as drug education, environmental education, and the education of the migrant worker.

Following the Commissioner's remarks, the meeting was opened to general discussion. The main topics of discussion concerned the administration of Federal educational activities, the Administration's proposed Department of Human Resources, the Federal role in education, and coordination between the Federal Government and the education community.

--reported by Edward Knudsen
(attendance: 36 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

A REPORT: "THE CONGRESS AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY"

THE HONORABLE JOHN DELLENBACK
Republican, Fourth District of Oregon

Friday, July 21, 1972

Congressman John Dellenback, ranking Republican on the House Special Subcommittee on Education and one of the architects of P.L. 92-318, the Education Amendments of 1972, opened the discussion with a brief personal history. Congressman Dellenback traced his career from the State legislature in Oregon State to the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. He pointed out the similarities between the functioning of the State legislature and the Congress and the value of service at the State level as a preparation for national service. He also noted the importance at the State level as well as at the federal level for an elected official to narrow down his interests and concentrate his attention and efforts in a particular area. For Congressman Dellenback this field was education and since his election in 1966 he has been a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Participants at this seminar on Congress and educational policy asked the following questions:

Q. Could you tell us something about committees within the party structure?

A. In the House we have the Republican Conference. This is a group of all Republican Members which meets periodically to discuss matters of national and party interest. Within the Conference there is a committee on research which has a series of task forces (which turn over every 2 years). The function of the committee on research and its task forces varies, depending on who is in the White House and who its chairman is. When I was on the task force on research and training we did research in the areas of day care and community colleges, partly because we had such difficulty obtaining information and arousing any interest within USOE. Our function was not to supercede the Education and Labor Committee but to do independent research which wasn't being considered by the Committee.

Q. How does a Congressman, representing 540,000 people, gather information regarding legislation?

A. Let me make a distinction between matters (1) handled by a committee on which you serve and (2) those handled by a committee on which you don't serve but in which you are interested. For (1) much knowledge and detail comes through the committee process - hearings, public and private testimony, staff work, discussion and debate with other Members. For (2) I read the committee report, especially the minority views. I also rely on the advice of my staff who have investigated the matter, and I spend time on the floor. I find the floor discussion very helpful in areas where I am not very knowledgeable.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

How does a Member get interested in a matter not within his committee jurisdiction? In a number of ways - from interest shown in the district, letters, telephone calls; also, when his attention is brought to the matter by his staff or his colleagues.

Q. How does the Congress arrive at final provisions in a bill? Do you have a long range policy approach to education?

A. No. One area in which Congress is weakest is oversight. Congress does not fulfill its responsibilities well to exercise legislative oversight. It tends to move from crisis to crisis. For example, now that we have passed necessary higher education legislation, I expect that in the 93d Congress we'll tackle school finance. Unfortunately, one thing we lost in the Legislative Reorganization Act was the provision for one staff person for every committee to be concerned with legislative oversight. This brings me to another point, and that is the importance of the teller vote. Formerly the teller vote recorded ayes and nays but anonymously. When the House was in the Committee of the Whole House there were no recorded teller votes. Now, recorded teller votes give a record of who voted how. The recorded teller vote encourages more Members to be present and to vote on an issue. As you may know, the House is moving to electronic voting. In order to implement this process it will be necessary to change the rules of the House and there could be a move to eliminate recorded teller votes. I am in favor of retaining the recorded teller vote.

Q. Are advisory councils effective in assisting Congress in maintaining oversight?

A. Partially. However, they are once removed from the Congress and their reports must filter through some one. And I am skeptical of the transmission of advisory committee reports into action. What we need are people on our committee staffs to review advisory reports and recommend means of implementation.

Q. OE is always being asked how to desegregate schools without busing, do you have any suggestions?

A. I have the advantage of being from a district which doesn't have a real desegregation problem. Of my 540,000 constituents, less than 10,000 are non-Caucasians, which may be as much a weakness as a strength in being objective on this issue. In Oregon busing has enabled us to improve educational quality, and I see busing as one possible tool in improving educational quality in other parts of the country. I am strongly opposed to a Constitutional amendment which would preclude the use of busing as a means of improving education. I voted against the Ashbrook and the Green amendments to S.659, the Education Amendments of 1972.

Q. What is your feeling about the working relationship between Capitol Hill and USOE? There are many middle-level people who would like to come forward and give technical assistance without subverting higher authority.

A. It would be very helpful if Members could talk individually with middle-level people. I try to use committee staff to reach out to OE people for the pros and cons of an issue and for suggestions. Congressional responsibilities really prevent Members from doing so themselves. The lines of communication need to go both ways and we do need to receive better input from those people who administer the programs.

Q. With regard to S.659 authorizations, OE is concerned about appropriations. The implementation of programs is dependent on funding. When will funds be available and how much?

A. The Congress is unrealistic with regard to authorizations. The Committees undercut themselves by being so unrealistic in authorizing funds. I would rather go to "such sums as may be necessary" and then people would not have false expectations. With regard to timing I sympathize with the difficulties of implementing legislation when appropriations are so late. It was our intention to have all appropriation bills passed before the beginning of the new fiscal year but as of June 30th only 2 had become law.

Q. In the original Senate bill, emergency assistance to colleges and universities could be used for operating expenses. Now some people feel that funds can only be used for studies of financial problems.

A. As one of the House-Senate conferees on the bill this second interpretation was certainly not my understanding. There does seem to be reasonable expectation that some money will be available for this emergency aid but I don't know how the Administration plans to spend it.

Q. Why are some provisions couched in very general terms and others in very specific terms? Is this done deliberately by Congress?

A. Congress sometimes consciously leaves a certain amount of discretion to the Executive branch. Sometimes, to be quite honest, Congress inadvertently neglects to include certain specifications and sometimes these decisions are left to staff. Complex bills which are Christmas trees are difficult to cope with, especially when non-germane amendments are added.

Q. When you don't have your mind made up on an issue and if Oregon's interests are not at stake how do the following affect your decisions: the White House, the Executive Department, associations, and colleagues?

A. First, I'd consider the opinions of my colleagues, especially those who have attended the hearings. You find that there are certain Members you can trust and on whom you can rely, and whose judgments you value. Second, I would consider the testimony of the Department, in the case of education, HEW. I've gotten good information from them in the past, expecially in areas that I'm not familiar with. Third, I'd say the associations and, last, the White House. Party pressure really doesn't enter into my decision making.

Q. How do education associations help or not help you?

A. The associations do give diluted summaries of the opinions of the education community. In the case of S.659 the education associations dealt less with Members directly but rather went to Congress more through their individual college members. And this was probably more effective. Education lobbies do help to give information, data, and opinions.

Q. After Congress appropriates money for programs often OE doesn't have the personnel to carry them out. What about some consideration in the appropriation, perhaps a percentage which would be earmarked for implementation?

A. This needs to be done in the authorizing legislation and not the appropriation bill. Most Members are generalists when it comes to implementation costs and wouldn't want to specify a percentage for administration of specific programs.

Q. Do you think that all of your efforts in trying to keep informed are effective in the end rather than just relying on your staff?

A. Yes, I believe that it's better to be informed and knowledgeable about issues and make informed judgments. The system works when the views of all are filtered through. I personally find it helpful to have the views of others. It helps me to see the forest as well as the trees.

I would also like to say that I'm a strong believer in Congressional reform. I would like to see a lot of changes. By the same token it has been my experience that most of the Members above average in their dedication to their responsibilities. For many, their day begins early and ends late but most are willing to make the effort which the job demands.

--reported by Colleen Campbell
(39 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

DR. THOMAS E. CRONIN

Research Political Scientist, The Brookings Institution

"POLICY-MAKING: A VIEW FROM THE WHITE HOUSE"

September 20, 1972

Dr. Cronin, currently a Research Political Scientist at Brookings Institution discussed his studies of the Presidency. He focused on the role and function of the Office of the President rather than on the individuals who have been elected presidents. Dr. Cronin examined the literature and also interviewed 50 White House aides and a couple of dozen cabinet officers. Some of his conclusions follow:

1. The Presidency is very fragile with respect to domestic policy. Various interest groups can and do apply "brakes" to Presidential actions and desires in the domestic sector.

2. The Presidential job (characterized by Dr. Cronin as "the GS-100 job") is difficult to describe. It constantly jumps around over an incredibly wide spectrum of interests. It doesn't focus on any set of interests.

3. There are, in effect, three policy sub-presidencies; one for national security and foreign policy; one for macro-economics or highly aggregated economics and one for domestic policy. In practice, national security and foreign policy has crowded out the other two sub-presidencies. Within each category there are six possible functional types of involvement: symbolic, priority setting, crisis management (riots, Pearl Harbor, Tet offensive, Cuba crisis, natural disasters, non-voluntary events), political (public support activities), management (follow-through on decisions), and governmental routines (processes by which programs are run). This classification enables the establishment of a matrix of categories and functions.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

	Symbolic	Priority Setting	Crisis Mgmt.	Political	Mgmt.	Gov't. Routines
National Security and Foreign Policy	X	X	X			
Macro-Economics Aggregate Economics	X	X		X		X
Domestic Policy	X	X	X	X	X	X

4. The White House has established a differentiated staffing pattern, mostly along professional lines. The groupings include: Domestic Policy and Legislative Program Staff, Budget and Economic Counselors, National Security and Foreign Policy Staff, Congressional Relations Staff and Administrative and Public Relations Staffs. The Cabinet is differentiated along program lines. The tendency, therefore, is for the White House staff and Cabinet to meet in small clusters in areas of mutual concern. Full Cabinet meetings are rare and become increasingly infrequent after the first year of a new Administration.

5. There is a lack of access to the White House and the President by most Cabinet members which results in conflict and frustration. Presidents tend to rely more and more on White House staffers and less and less on departments. There is frequent claim that the Cabinet members become captured by their departments and the bureaucracy. Presidents become frustrated trying to move an "uncooperative bureaucracy" and "to get things done". There is also the matter of a President's time. The symbolic, priority setting and crisis management functions are time-consuming and tend to crowd out the other matters. Foregoing contact with Cabinet members is a resultant trade-off.

6. One idea that has been advanced by political scientists is that of a one-term,six-year presidency. Theoretically, this would allow a president to concentrate his time and energy on programs. It would take out of the Presidency the need to spend time on cosmetic, image-making popularity focusing activities. It would require a better informed public, however, on issues of national importance. However, Cronin doubts that the "politics" can or should be removed from the office.

7. The President must take an "activist" role. He must do something. He cannot take a neutral or idle stance. The bureaucracy is essentially conservative. They are defenders of the status quo, and if the President wants to accomplish anything new, he must be the activist. Hence, he tends to rely on White House staff rather than the Cabinet departments.

8. The following represents a list of "do's" and "don't's" for the Presidency, as offered by some students of the Presidency.

a. Be a consensus leader--when the polls are positive. Be a forward leader when the polls are unfavorable.

b. Travel widely overseas (act as a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize).

c. Avoid party and fund-raising activities.

d. Avoid involvement in "Watergate" incidents. Stay above them. Delegate to subordinates and surrogates.

e. Accentuate role of symbolic leader. If forced to delegate ceremonial activities, pass on to one's family, never outsiders.

f. Keep the Vice-President and Cabinet members in a subordinate role. Never let them upstage you.

g. Proclaim an open government, but practice secrecy.

h. Cultivate press, but conceal unfavorable events.

i. Expand the Executive Office.

j. Fend off investigations.

k. Leave the Office of the President larger than it was at the beginning.

9. In the question and answer period the following key points were made:

a. The Presidency does not pay more attention to agencies such as OE, OEO, etc. because it is frustrated by budget constraints, Congressional interests and similar limitations.

b. The Presidency gives priority attention to "hot issues"--legislation, crises, etc. and it follows the public opinion polls carefully. Hence, it does not spend much time on marginal budget decisions except of necessity.

c. The role of the White House staff is to serve the President. They also tend to promote special rather than general public interests.

---reported by Bert Mogin
(attendance: 33 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

ELMER B. STAATS
Comptroller General of the United States

"THE GAO AND THE EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

Thursday, October 12, 1972

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FROM MEETING WITH ELMER STAATS

Q: Has passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 increased the amount of work GAO has done for congressional committees, and will it do more in the future?

A: We've been somewhat disappointed in the response of Congress to their own legislative initiative. The Water Pollution Control Act includes a provision authorizing evaluation by GAO of demonstration programs in addition to agency evaluation. Family Assistance Program also contains provisions for evaluations. In the social area we have requests for evaluations of programs that have just gotten off the ground including--Emergency School Aid Program, Emergency Employment, and Occupational Health and Safety.

Q: What proportion of your requests are from specific Members? How many are more politically motivated (spectacular-oriented) than program oriented? How do you decide which to do?

A: We do not close the door to requests from individual Members. A request that relates to a problem in a district could be developed into a more general investigation of great merit. We cannot just honor Committee Chairmen and purport to be nonpartisan. We negotiate our requests on the basis of feasibility, and the fact that it is something they cannot get from an agency itself. While it is easier to do our own initiating, we are here to serve Congress.

Q: What is your policy for releasing reports to the public?

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

A: If we have initiated the study, we release it to the press a day after it goes to Congress. If an individual member requested the the study, he can release it whenever he wants to. Often the Appropriations Committee will sit on a study until an agency witness is testifying before their committee.

Q: Is there a role for GAO to look across programs comparatively?

A: We are aware of a potential role here. Last January we reorganized our offices for cross-purposes. We have combined Health/Manpower/Education into one division. We are presently doing a study of income security in which we are drawing on the interrelationships of various programs. Our procurement program studies cut across agencies as do our studies of retirement systems.

Q: How can the legislative process be improved to arrive at specified program objectives in order to make evaluation possible? do you contrast the cost-effectiveness of different programs?

A: Congressional committees need to come to some agreement on indices of evaluation so that either GAO or an agency can evaluate a program. The recently approved Health Professions Act included indicators. These included goals for the number of doctors needed and the capacity of schools to meet this deficit. However, deciding how to improve the "quality" of education becomes more difficult.

It is very difficult to contrast cost-effectiveness of programs in different fields. If one compares an education to a health program one runs into the question of priorities and therefore value-judgements. If the programs are within the same field and are supposed to serve the same clientele,contrasting can be done.

Q: Have you given any consideration to evaluating formulas for distribution of federal funds re:effectiveness?

A: Not much. We have done some evaluating of highway fund formulas, but for the most part is quite difficult to do. General Revenue-Sharing will make this even more difficult.

Q: What kind of staff support do you have? Do you use contractors, call on Office of Education expertise, use consultants?

A: We try to take advantage of any work that has already been done. We have used both consultants and contractors. Consultants have been more helpful.

Q: Do you train congressional staff on how to draft legislation that can be evaluated?

A: We are presently advising staffs on writing legislation that can be evaluated. However, the compromise legislative process is bound to result in "fuzzed up" objectives. Revenue-Sharing is an example of this. Often program objectives can be straightened out when a program comes up for re-authorization. We have an many as 100 people on assignment to committees. We have offered our services to committees, but we do not want to become the "think tank" for Congress relating to national priorities and other issues.

---reported by Ellen Sudow
(attendance: 39 persons)

PART II

VIEWPOINTS: ON GOVERNANCE IN THE SCHOOLS

In the last 10 years schools at the elementary and secondary levels have been hit by a tidal wave of unfamiliar pressures. School boards and administrators have been especially vulnerable to the diverse needs of our multiplistic society. They have been challenged in court to provide equal educational services within a district (Judge Skelly Wright's D.C. decisions), and among districts in the same state (in *Serrano*). They have been asked (in 29 states) and sued (in the school fraud cases) to become responsible for educational outcomes of their students. They have been faced with a new teacher militancy which demands changes in working conditions as well as in salary levels. They have been challenged to provide innovative curricula and alternative learning situations which better meet the needs of their students. Amid all of these pressures, they have been faced with significantly increased financial pressures through the failure of millage elections and (for private schools) through inflationary forces which push the cost of education beyond the reach of many families.

ESS programs in this area have presented a continuing discussion of these problem areas.....

ESS **EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR**
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "THE STRUGGLE FOR INTEGRATED QUALITY EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA-- TWO INSIDERS'SUBJECTIVE VIEWS" - PART I

Remarks of M. Hayes Mizell
Director, South Carolina Community Relations Program
of the American Friends Service Committee
November 23, 1970

Like the "struggle for quality integrated education," South Carolina is not a simple place. An understanding of that fact is essential, for among those persons who have spent some time in South Carolina there is almost unanimous agreement that it is not subject to many of the generalizations and stereotypes usually applied to other Deep South states.

Dr. Robert Coles, the Harvard psychiatrist and author, has written that: "No other southern State can match South Carolina's ability to resist the claims of black people without becoming the object of national scorn."

Marshall Frady, a contributing editor of Harper's magazine who went to school in the state, has observed that: "South Carolina has long persevered as one of the most conscientiously innocuous States in the Union: without the dark glamour of Mississippi or even the hot hasty dingy meanness of Alabama. throughout most of the classic southern decade of the Negro Awakening she seemed merely to lack the vitality for any serious viciousness. It was as if her defense were a colossal dullness."

Or we can take the view of a native South Carolinian, reporter Jack Bass, who has written in his recent book, The Orangeburg Massacre: "Historically, an aristocratic racism had dominated the white South Carolina social and political structure--a racism in which Negroes were looked upon as children rather than as a lower class of being and in which lower-class whites are also looked down upon.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

It contrasted with the democratic racism that prevailed in the Deep South in which all whites shared a sense of equality because they were white."

Thus, the journalistic interpretations of what makes the state unique are as contradictory as the forces at work within the state which seem to cry out for interpretation. Accept whatever view you like--the presence of a sophisticated and subtle conspiracy, the existence of a kind of psychic anemia, or the consequence of rule by a genteel oligarchy that allowed its distorted sense of humanity--but humanity nevertheless--to temper its ideological commitment to the maintenance of a rigid caste system based almost as much on social class as on race.

The interpretations are interesting but what is more important is for us to try to understand the climate that demands these groping and limited attempts to explain what makes South Carolina unique as a Southern state. It is this climate, as it relates to the struggle for quality integrated education, that I want to briefly describe this evening. I hope you will keep in mind that perhaps the climate is more relevant to that struggle than are some of the facts that I will also be giving you.

As I have already suggested, South Carolina is a state of contradictions. For nearly a score of years the state's Establishment fought to deter the moral and legal challenges to a dual system of public education based on race. That fight was expensive, bitter, and intense. It consumed, to a fantastic degree, the best of the state's intellectual, financial, and political resources. There was every reason to believe that the state would never let go without experiencing the throes of violence.

Yet, today South Carolina has given up. Structural desegregation--the desegregation resulting from massive shifting of bodies and the establishment of schools which are not clearly identifiable by race--this structural desegregation has come in a significant way to the state. For most of the state's school children structural desegregation is a daily reality. Many of them, and their parents, now wonder what the fuss of the past 20 years was all about.

But "the school situation"--as it is now called--is still a real concern. South Carolinians are possessed by the same vague fears relating to discipline, race, and busing as one can find in almost any other place in this nation. People vent these fears in "letters to the editor," PTA meetings, school board meetings.

The image of "double dipped integrationist" on the school board is enough to stimulate 15,000 write-in votes against such a candidate in a local election.

And the contradictions remain: A gubernatorial candidate (Rep. Watson) and proven vote-getter fails when he attempts to calculatingly combine piety and demagoguery to play upon these fears, and to exploit the issues or race and schools as he has successfully done in the past. The electorate sends three blacks to the legislature for the first time in nearly one hundred years. Even the "activist integrationist" gets elected to the school board.

One good example of the state's schizophrenia was the annual public meeting of school patrons held in Florence, S.C., last spring. This meeting is like an old New England town meeting--once a year the patrons of the school district gather to elect school board members, to hear reports on the schools, and to approve or disapprove tax measures. At this meeting the patrons defeated a proposed increase in local taxation in a gesture of defiance against the federal government's so-called "forced integration." But then they elected a black man to the school board for the first time in decades. The issues were, of course, quite separate but the point is that the attitudes and actions of many South Carolinians defy labels and categories.

Thus, the struggle for quality integrated education is made all the more difficult because it is impossible to honestly generalize about the forces you are struggling against. There are honest efforts at structural desegregation which are in such contrast to the resistance of the past that one is tempted to extoll the "progress" in South Carolina. But this is tempered by the realization that in most school districts there is no meaningful integration of black and white students, no meaningful integration of educational and intellectual expectations of the two racial groups by the educators, no meaningful integration of the "roles" which members of the two racial groups are expected to fulfill in South Carolina life and labor. There is no meaningful integration of control over and authority in the schools which house the two races.

If you visit South Carolina you will find your stereotypes melting away as you experience courtesy instead of the expected hostility. You will find first rate minds doing first rate work in an atmosphere of isolation and with inadequate resources. You will find even some genuinely innovative and meaningful programs that are designed to honestly aid children regardless of their race or class.

You will be impressed by all of these things, not so much because of the quality or the commitment or the creativity you found, but because you expected so little. Chances are that South Carolina has only been a place of which you have heard little except Strom Thurmond, the Charleston garbage workers' strike, the overturning of the school bus at Lamar, hunger and malnutrition. All of your images will have been negative or there will have been no images at all. In comparison, the things that you will experience and the programs that you see will stand out in bold relief. You will experience your own personal version of Antonio's "Blowup"--a distortion of reality.

But what is the reality? It's that last year, for the first time, 50 percent of our students who had started the first grade made it out of the twelfth grade. It's that we finally re-enacted a compulsory school attendance law several years ago, but that it does not become compulsory for all school districts until 1974. It's that only one school district in the state has utilized the Teacher Corps. It's that a kindergarten program is still considered an innovation which we must initiate in a piece-meal and conservative fashion. It's that many school districts in the state maintain a system of having school board members appointed by the Governor upon the recommendation of the state legislative delegation from that county--sometimes one man makes such a recommendation. It's that the services of the Title IV-funded school desegregation consulting center at the University of South Carolina have been used by only about one-third of the state's 93 school districts. It's that although the state receives about $30 million from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, school districts throughout the state continue to violate federal regulations requiring public disclosure of Title I activities and citizen involvement, and that the use of Title I for supplanting and general aid is rampant throughout the state. It's that funds secured under the Emergency School Assistance Program are also being used as general aid for such items as air conditioners and grass seed and that districts are again violating requirements which call for citizen participation and monitoring of ESAP programs.

These are the realities. It is the reality too that in many of the state's 35 school districts which have a majority black student enrollment but which are still rigidly controlled by those who fostered and sought to maintain the dual system of education, "quality education" is a myth and a farce for most students. Here are the districts that are hopelessly poor. Here is the isolation that fails to hold or attract the ambitious teacher or administrator. Here are the students whose heritage is either no education, inferior education, or mis-education, and whose only hope for the future is escape.

And finally, in addition to all of these depressing liabilities, here too are the traditional school systems which are so locked to the past that their very method of operation is in reality a disaster for their constituencies. And what is really tragic is that it is in these places where the school administrator's assertion that "We have a system of education of which we can all be proud," and that "We are trying to meet the needs of every student" is more often than not a deception and a lie.

Compounding these realities and the contradictions is a malaise which grips our people. I wish that I could tell you that there is even one well organized group of citizens that is concerned. Yet, the problems of these districts are severe and in spite of their gravity and magnitude they are receiving precious little attention from the state or the federal government. It is considered a major victory to find a Follow Through program here, a day care or kindergarten program there. But, by and large, everything is inadequate about these districts and when graduation comes those who have managed to survive 12 years of this kind of education get on the train and go North--to what? Or, increasingly, they go to the urban centers of the South. But wherever they go they are unprepared either for skilled work or for urban life--of such things are the Rochesters, Newarks, and now Atlantas made.

So how do you cope with this? If you are the state's Establishment you go for vocational education. For these majority black districts are also the least industrialized areas of the state and the hope is that if you develop a pool of skilled or semi-skilled citizens then the industry will come. So for all practical purposes you write off one generation of school children, you hope and you work for progress--albeit within the states reverence for maintaining the triple A bond rating, keeping the "outsiders" out, and by approaching change with circumspection and by always holding to the middle-of-the-road. You don't consider that you are training people--not educating them. You don't question the relation of today's training to tomorrow's needs. You build an educational system which provides grist for the industrial mill... which probably defines--just as the old dual system did--that there are "places" reserved in our society and in its labor force for those of a certain race and class. You hope for change through gentle persuasion as the State Department of Education maintains a position of benign neutrality which allows local school districts to defy the few and paltry state standards that do exist. The sovereignty of the school district comes first--the education of our people comes second. So the educational goal takes on a single focus: lift our people from poverty, let them live the "good life."

These are noble and worthy ambitions--they are the same ones that a generation of adults shaped by the Great Depression defined for themselves. For a region that has known only deprivation and desperation for so long, they are natural goals. Yet, even if you accept these there is every reason to question the means to the end. There is every reason to question what kind of society our people will be prepared to build, with calling our educational system to task or trying, complex as it may be, to mobilize public opinion to do so. In fact, those who are struggling for quality integrated education are few in number and there is not a great deal of clarity as to how they should go about it or just who the "enemy" really is. There are groups working for professional rights--for whites--in the educational arena. There are groups of enlightened individuals working for better education, although not necessarily for quality education since no one in South Carolina has really defined that term, but these groups are largely unorganized. Perhaps the task merely seems too huge, but I suspect at the root of our inertia lies the problem which seems to infect nearly every area of South Carolina life. That problem is simply a lack of leadership.

It is this lack of leadership that makes us pessimistic about the educational future of the majority black school districts in the state, for it is lacking both within the structure of education itself as well as outside it. Certainly it would help if HEW and the U.S. Office of Education really intended to enforce the regulations supposedly governing the use of millions of dollars of Title I funds that go into these districts. But I have no reason to believe that that will happen. The brutal truth is that once that money leaves Washington it is virtually free to be used in any way the local school district sees fit--the regulations and guidelines be damned.

Perhaps it is because of my experience over the past five years or perhaps it is only that I have read too many editorials in the local newspaper, but now I too question the value of such guidelines and regulations. I have personally witnessed the fraud of such regulations as related to Title VI, Title I, and the Emergency School Assistance Program.

In the final analysis it is the people that make the difference, not the guidelines or even the program. So I won't appeal to you to work with what is already there to make the struggle for a quality integrated education easier. Instead, let me suggest a new program...A program that assumes that the involvement of black and white lay citizens of all economic levels is crucial to the development of a quality integrated education in South Carolina...A program that puts the people ahead of the national education lobby or ahead of the fears of the local school superintendent.

I am simply suggesting that this government establish a program of citizen leadership training in the field of education that gives priority to training citizens from those areas where public education is most badly in need of citizen support and challenge. Such a program should involve ladies from the League of Women Voters as well as those from the Fairfield County Improvement Organization. The training itself should extend over a period of six months, after which the individuals involved would return to their communities and work for another year as "community education fellows." While I cannot be excessively detailed here it is obvious that such training should include a broad range of experiences, exposure to proven workable models around the country, and it should be aimed at developing in target areas persons who would, by virtue of their training experience, know more about the problems and alternative solutions available to public education in their communities.

It is our conviction that quality integrated education in South Carolina will never be a reality if that struggle is left merely to the political or professional educational leaders. The contradictions, the malaise, and the professionalism are just too big a barrier for most of our people to cope with.

(attendance: 63 persons)

APPENDIX

1 - Thirty percent of teachers educated in S.C. leave the state.

2 - More than 1,000 teachers teach outside of the subject area in which they were qualified

3 - 34.7 percent of our teachers are substandard in qualification.

4 - S.C. needs 450 reading specialists--those that we already have are concentrated at the secondary rather than at the elementary level.

5 - 76,000 children of school age are not enrolled in school.

6 - Only 50 percent of the state's elementary schools are certified by the State.

7 - 10,000 children annually repeat the first grade.
(7 percent white, 14 percent black)

8 - 60 percent of the schools do not provide any pre-school experience at all.

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "THE STRUGGLE FOR INTEGRATED QUALITY EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA-- TWO INSIDERS' SUBJECTIVE VIEWS" -- PART II

November 23, 1970

Mrs. Frieda Mitchell:

Field Supervisor for Penn Community Services and an elected member of the Beaufort County School Board, also serves on the South Carolina Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and on the Advisory Council of the Beaufort/Jasper Comprehensive Health Program (OEO-funded). Long active in South Carolina NAACP activities, Mrs. Mitchell also served on the School Desegregation Task Force, a joint project of the American Friends Service Committee and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

Mr. M. Hayes Mizell:

Director, American Friends Service Committee, South Carolina Community Relations Program, Member, Board of School Commissioners of Richland County School District No. 1.

Mrs. Mitchell followed Mr. Mizell's presentation by agreeing that, superficially at least, the concept of a unitary education system appears to be accepted, while the underlying intent illustrated by the actual desegregation plan adopted in her county (Beaufort County) raises many legitimate doubts about its sincerity.

Though their schools removed Confederate flags from classrooms, no longer indulge in rousing renditions of "Dixie", and even more significantly have not fired or demoted any black teachers, there is recurrent evidence that the integration being undertaken has been one-sided; black into white and never vice versa. Under the current desegregation plan, black schools have repeatedly been phased out in favor of integrating white schools. There have been no visible cases of a white school being phased out in favor of a black school to achieve racial balance.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Whether because of convenience to the majority of students served or the overall superiority of its physical or structural facilities, the desirability of maintaining a former predominantly black school seems to be conspicuously ignored by school administrators. Decisions have invariably been made to close the black school and keep the white one open at all costs.

Mrs. Mitchell feels that this is merely another example of race fear and hatred. "Whites just don't want to use anything that has been used by blacks".

She went on to relate a successful boycott by 300 white parents to remove a black school principal. Furthermore, she described a situation in one school where there appears to be a systematic exclusion of black assistant principals from meaningful school administration by its white principal. The principal makes policy while his black assistants are stationed at desks in the halls policing the students.

As a natural consequence of this desolate system the black students feel like outsiders and have lost even a minimal interest in their school activities.

Mrs. Mitchell closed the formal discussion by calling for legislative action to prohibit the closing of black schools for purely racial reasons and for stringent enforcement of Federal regulations against misuse of funds.

Mrs. Mitchell was asked to elaborate on the situation where black assistant principals were stationed at desks in school hallways. She told us of a white principal, isolated in a distant office somewhere in the school building making all policy decisions without the knowledge or consultation of his black assistants. It appeared that the main occupation he insisted his black assistants be relegated to was the monitoring of students during the change of classes.

Asked how many of the school board members and school administration in her county were black, she replied: two black women and six white men on the Beaufort Board. While the majority of school administrators are white, there is one black coordinator of Title I, and four other black administrators.

Asked if her presence on the school board was making any appreciable impact on the policies she had heretofor decried, Mrs. Mitchell explained that she is definitely in a minority opinion, too weak to sway the actions of the school board.

On a hopeful note, she felt that her presence had a positive impact on the black community in that she was able to let them know what was going on.

Mr. Mizell was asked to describe the spending practices and violations of Title I money, and how he thought spending could be improved, furthermore, how would he spend the money if he had the chance? He answered: though an initial application for grants might specify, for example, a remedial reading program, when the grant was finally approved and received by the local school board, the initial proposal was summarily disregarded and perhaps spent on something like barbells for the gymnasium. He suggested, conversely that he would spend the money on basic skills such as reading and curriculum revision instead of the physical layout of the school which is how the money is spent now.

Mr. Mizell was asked how he felt about the proposed additional billion and a half dollar increase now pending under the existing Emergency School Aid Program. He replied that there are very real problems in desegregation; academic as well as human. Funds received under this program now are being spent, on a small scale, for such things as teacher aides, curriculum revision, etc., but most of it is not. He feels there is just no monitoring of funds once they have been appropriated and, furthermore, while the small local private organizations (including parent groups) are doing most of the reforming and all of the sincere desegregation work, they receive only 10 percent of available funds. The other 90 percent of the money goes to the traditional administration that continues to do absolutely nothing constructive.

Asked what the role of the American Friends Committee, NAACP, Legal Defense Fund, and other such local private community groups was, Mizell told us that "something has to be done to bring people together as people" and this is their role.

He was then asked what he would do with the grant he hoped to receive under the Emergency School Aid Program in his school district. In Richland County the black teacher ratio was lower than the black student ratio and he plans to up this level by spending part of the money on a recruitment program to attract black teachers. He would also like to do some work in curriculum revision in areas like black history, etc., and would like to develop biracial student programs or "cool-it-committees" to help ease racial tension.

Mizell was asked how his school board could have used Emergency School Aid Funds better. He noted that $25 million was designated for student programs that none of the students knew anything about. As a matter of fact, a program was hurriedly designed, without student involvement, and given a black principal to head it who had nothing whatever to do with its development. He is convinced that in order to prevent this from happening again the board must develop a program of community liaison to foster an exchange of ideas and relevant information among parents, students, and the school system.

Mizell was asked to assume that the guidelines and regulations for receipt of Federal funding were stringently enforced to the relevant problems he raised. Does he feel that school boards would still ask for money knowing that they would have to spend it "legitimately"? He felt, basically, that the people did not want "legitimate" programs; "They can be bought off, but they need leverage".

Asked if there was a local Advisory Committee to deal with Title I funds in his school district, Mizell replied that though many school districts have one, his does not. In any event, he feels that they merely parrot the local school board.

Mizell and Mrs. Mitchell were asked if they felt the enforcement of the Title I regulations concerning parental involvement and community participation would make any difference. They agreed that though the burden falls on private groups to become knowledgeable, there is some real hope for change if these groups make a real effort to learn about the newest research, model programs, and educational alternatives in the field.

Mrs. Mitchell was asked if she had brought her grievances about the system before her school board. She explained that she had, but was always voted down by the other members, as a matter of course, who insisted she didn't know what she was talking about.

Someone then raised a question about the results of the black students' indifference to their school. Had it, indeed, resulted in a higher drop out rate? Mrs. Mitchell noted that the black attrition rate was not abnormally higher since desegregation was instituted.

Asked if the existing legislation was adequate, given proper administration, or would the desegregation program require new legislation, Mizell's opinion was that the difficulties lie solely with the administration and distribution of funds, and not with the legislation itself. He reiterated that even if the school boards desired to act in good faith, there is simply no direction from anywhere, in terms of expertise, to guide their efforts. On the other hand, Mrs. Mitchell stressed the natural tendency to place the burden of change unfairly on shoulders of blacks. She feels this is an unrealistic expectation of Southern blacks who have been so traditionally suppressed, and denied basic rights (taken for granted by whites), that the majority are still unaware of the benefits of a decent education because they've never been allowed to have one.

Mrs. Mitchell was asked if there was any reliable newspaper coverage of the school board meetings. She explained there was only limited coverage because any "real issue" was invariably discussed behind the closed doors of an Executive Session, and coverage and/or public discussion was prohibited.

Mizell agreed to the following statement that, given strict enforcement of guidelines, the real question is what can be done to actually improve conditions. He went on to note that, with the exception of a few conscientious superintendents in isolated areas throughout South Carolina, the superintendent can usually get the school board to accept any proposal he makes due to the general lack of reliable information and direction concerning relevant new methods and approaches to quality education. He stressed this as another obvious example of the crying need for informed community groups.

Regarding the 1964 enactment of Title VI, Mizell was asked if it had any impact on the black community. He felt that initially there were great expectations. Blacks believed they would have the first real opportunity to be heard, but nothing had happened. Asked what this impact of non-enforcement has had on the white community, he discovered that there is a widespread attitude of "Don't fool with it". The motions of processing complaints are undertaken but it is understood that once a program is funded, anything at all can be done with the money.

A question was raised concerning the effectiveness of school desegregation centers at the state universities. Mr. Mizell thought they were a step in the right direction; though their contribution has been small, they cannot be disregarded. The problem in most cases is that there is no recycling of teachers, or suitable follow up of participants, etc.

Mrs. Mitchell was asked if she thought it conceivable that control of the school board could be achieved if the right superintendent were in power. She replied that it was possible, but not likely to happen.

Mitchell and Mizell then commented when questioned whether they felt the superintendent and his deputies would be able to circumvent Title I if the guidelines were enforced, that the superintendents would definitely find a way. All of their experience with the Federal Government has been quite discouraging. It appears there is no will to enforce guidelines and regulations, and though they continue to look for Federal direction, they find none. They conclude again that the answer to the struggle remains in igniting local community-level training of citizen groups with their full knowledge of the inherent weakness in their conspicuous lack of adequate financial resources.

To the suggestion that the situation described this evening was utterly hopeless and desperate in terms of reform of programs for the disadvantaged, Mr. Mizell and Mrs. Mitchell pledged to use the tools they already have, and create new ones if necessary to find solutions. Mizell re-asserted that South Carolina is begging for direction and local leadership in education and would welcome any offer of a viable solution.

Asked if a voucher system would deal with any of these problems, Mizell replied that he was wary of the dual institution a voucher system might create. Though he is primarily inclined to maintain and strengthen the existing public schools, he would be willing to try it on an experimental basis.

--Reported by Arlene Horowitz
(attendance: 63 persons)

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "TEACHER MILITANCY IN THE '70's," AUGUST 10, 1970

(attendance: 37 persons)

Dave Selden, National President of the American Federation of Teachers, and William H. Simons, President of the Washington, D.C. Teachers' Union, discussed the role of the Union in the teaching profession and the subject of teacher militancy.

Selden stressed the fundamental need for the expenditure of more money for education. Noting that comprehensive education is a uniquely American goal, he added that the realization of that goal requires the commitment of even more resources to education than we have currently committed. Dwindling markets for unskilled labor, coupled with a growing sensitivity for the educational problems of racial minorities are causing increased scepticism about our present system of large-unit instruction and low-unit cost. He concluded that teachers are not yet militant enough about such issues as class size and the conditions conducive to quality education.

Simons noted that District schools face serious budgetary problems attributable to the necessity of securing annual appropriations from the Congress. The most serious problems, he noted, were the result of the composition of the District appropriations subcommittees. He continued by criticizing the recently completed Clark Report on the District schools. The most serious shortcoming of the report was its failure to look behind the results of standardized tests and to question their ability to provide an accurate measure of aptitude. The schools must educate students for a role in the community and not just prepare them to pass standardized tests.

Martin (OMB) began the questioning by asking how teachers' unions would respond to growing concern with and interest in the principle of accountability and the technique of performance contracting. Selden replied that he completely agreed that schools should be accountable to the public they serve, but he added that private firms are not entitled to exclusive rights to new or innovative teaching techniques. He again emphasized that there is no substitute, over time, for the investment of more money in education.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Keen (OE) asked what role the union was playing in improving the quality of teaching as opposed to simply seeking higher teachers' salaries. Selden said the answer to the problem of increased quality of teaching was to raise the stature of teachers by improving their professional position.

Simons also noted his agreement with the principle of accountability, but added that differences in individual rates of development among students make it impossible to arrive at standardized criteria for judging students fairly. He objected to the application of standardized or assembly-line thinking to educational evaluation.

A study was mentioned which demonstrated that high school graduates could, within six weeks, master the skills necessary to teach reading to elementary school students. Would the union support such a plan?

Selden answered that, while the union had taken a positive position on the concept of new careers in education and on paraprofessionals, he disagreed that the major responsibility for teaching should be turned over to high school graduates. His feeling was that teachers were under-educated rather than over-educated.

Mrs. Phillips (Republican Education and Training Task Force) asked how Selden interpreted recent data showing a surplus of teachers in the labor market. Selden replied that these figures indicated a shortage of teaching positions rather than a surplus of teachers and noted again that smaller class size would increase both the quality of education and the demand for teachers. Simons attributed the teacher surplus to an influx of people into the educational system from non-educational jobs in the private sector of the economy. He added, in support of a decreased pupil-teacher ratio, that large class size prevents the teacher from dealing adequately with classroom heterogeneity.

O'Keefe (OS/HEW) noted studies indicating that there is no difference in educational results accruing from smaller class size.

Saunders (OS/HEW) observed that the assembly-line approach of the school systems, referred to earlier by Simons, was matched by a similar attitude in the teaching profession. He noted resistance to differentiated staffing as an example. Simons agreed that differentiated staffing was a good idea but indicated that, under present conditions in most school systems, it was prohibitively expensive. He also noted that the innovation team approach was proving successful on a small scale in the District schools.

Lewis (Senator Brooke) referred to Temple City, California, where the costs of differentiated staffing were no greater than before its initiation. Davies (AC/OE) clarified the observation by saying that the start-up costs of the plan were greater than the previous operating costs of the system, but that long-range operating costs would be the same as under the previous system.

Lewis asked if Simons approved of any of the conclusions of the Clark report on the District schools. Simons said he generally approved of the report's emphasis on the importance of developing reading and arithmetical skills, but disapproved of its emphasis on the necessity to prepare students to master standardized tests, the instruments of a "white racist society."

Cohen (OS/HEW) observed that supply and demand largely determine the salaries of teachers. Why, then, should the public pay higher salaries if they are getting qualified teachers for lower salaries? Selden replied that higher starting salaries would have the effect of attracting more qualified teachers to the profession.

Millenson (Senate Labor Committee) asked for comments on the role of the Federal government in education in the 1970's.

Selden replied that States, not the Federal government, should assume the major responsibility for the support of education and should move to that responsibility by implementing state-wide property tax systems. Present State equalization systems have failed to achieve equity in education finance. In addition, the Federal government could increase its level of support to $15 million in the '70's without any substantial loss in efficiency. He added that he had no fears that increases in Federal support would bring with them increases in Federal control over education.

Zangwill (OS/HEW) suggested that perhaps the Clark report should be implemented in some District schools and that the union should devise a plan for implementation in other District schools, proving an opportunity for the two alternative approaches to be tested against each other. Simons and Selden indicated a desire to present an alternative to the Clark report and invited competition between the two proposals. Simons added that the Clark report would probably be too expensive to be practical in the District at the present time.

Sallada (OC/OE) asked why the AFT was opposed to the Administration's rumored nominee for Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland. Selden replied that Marland's record as Superintendent of Schools in Pittsburgh was consistently anti-union.

Lewis (Senator Brooke) referred to Temple City, California, where the costs of differentiated staffing were no greater than before its initiation. Davies (AC/OE) clarified the observation by saying that the start-up costs of the plan were greater than the previous operating costs of the system, but that long-range operating costs would be the same as under the previous system.

Lewis asked if Simons approved of any of the conclusions of the Clark report on the District schools. Simons said he generally approved of the report's emphasis on the importance of developing reading and arithmetical skills, but disapproved of its emphasis on the necessity to prepare students to master standardized tests, the instruments of a "white racist society."

Cohen (OS/HEW) observed that supply and demand largely determine the salaries of teachers. Why, then, should the public pay higher salaries if they are getting qualified teachers for lower salaries? Selden replied that higher starting salaries would have the effect of attracting more qualified teachers to the profession.

Millenson (Senate Labor Committee) asked for comments on the role of the Federal government in education in the 1970's.

Selden replied that States, not the Federal government, should assume the major responsibility for the support of education and should move to that responsibility by implementing state-wide property tax systems. Present State equalization systems have failed to achieve equity in education finance. In addition, the Federal government could increase its level of support to $15 million in the '70's without any substantial loss in efficiency. He added that he had no fears that increases in Federal support would bring with them increases in Federal control over education.

Zangwill (OS/HEW) suggested that perhaps the Clark report should be implemented in some District schools and that the union should devise a plan for implementation in other District schools, proving an opportunity for the two alternative approaches to be tested against each other. Simons and Selden indicated a desire to present an alternative to the Clark report and invited competition between the two proposals. Simons added that the Clark report would probably be too expensive to be practical in the District at the present time.

Sallada (OC/OE) asked why the AFT was opposed to the Administration's rumored nominee for Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland. Selden replied that Marland's record as Superintendent of Schools in Pittsburgh was consistently anti-union.

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*
PRESENTATION ON "LEADING THE D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS"

Remarks of Dr. Hugh J. Scott, Superintendent, D.C. Public Schools
October 28, 1979

To be successful, the big city superintendent of today must combine philosophical soundness with operational toughness. He must not only possess the technical and managerial skills which are necessary for the job, but must also demonstrate the ability to handle dynamic and often controversial social, economic and political issues. The kind of superintendent needed in urban school systems is one who views administration in terms of educational and social leadership. This new breed of superintendent must operate in the political, economic and social spheres of the community in order to know what improvements are needed and how they may best be secured. He must seek support from both inside and outside the school system.

I have often been asked why I would want to be Superintendent of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. My usual reply is a quote from my respected former boss, Detroit Superintendent Norman Drachler: "If you have to suffer, you may as well suffer at the top." It is my hope to remain as superintendent in Washington for a few years; however, if I am going to succeed in resolving the many problems the school system faces, I am going to need a great deal of help. I urge each of you to offer your assistance to the public schools for this is a community which offers special challenges and special opportunities. There is a critical job to be done in this predominantly black community--to develop a quality school system. It is the responsibility of everyone in the community to work to improve the schools. The Federal agencies should also provide assistance for they are a large part of this community.

Dr. Kenneth Clark stated in his Design for Academic Achievement prepared for the D.C. Public Schools that normal children can succeed in school if properly taught. I agree with Dr. Clark's assertion; however, it is important to recognize that many of the children in our public schools live in an abnormal environment.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

For this reason, we must tackle those forces which impede normal educational development. Currently, we do not have the resources to compensate for the many detrimental effects of poverty. For example, Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act cannot completely compensate for the effects of inadequate housing.

The schools today in many ways reflect the social policy of our society. They have a considerable amount of influence on the distribution of power in society. One of the reasons I am in the position of Superintendent is to prevent race from being used as a basis for the denial of power. It is my belief that this can be achieved by providing quality education for our predominantly black student population. Under these circumstances, integration is not an issue of great concern; nonetheless there are other forms of social class discrimination in our schools which we must seek to eliminate. We must strive to improve all of the schools in the District of Columbia not just those in some areas of the city. We must restore the image of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia so that parents all over the city, no matter what their economic circumstance, will want their children to attend our schools.

This brings me to the subject of community control. It is my feeling that the schools should be accountable to the communities they serve and that the members of the community should be active partners in the educational process. However, I am not in favor of extremes in community control of the schools. As Superintendent of Schools, I am being held accountable. Therefore, I want the appropriate control over personnel in order to be able to place competent people in the key instructional posts. I want to establish professional expectations for teachers. Effective administration is applying appropriate resources effectively in a given situation. The superintendent should have the flexibility to apply resources, both human and financial, in the most effective manner to resolve educational problems.

The Clark Plan provides an excellent opportunity to focus attention on the basic academic skills and to hold the school system accountable. There can be little doubt that the system needs to be overhauled. Yet the job can't be done piecemeal--we have to do it all at once. A strong central administrative staff is needed to provide the superintendent with the basic information and support which is needed to operate the school system effectively.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. What is the proper role for parents?

A. Policy should not be made at a hundred different local levels. If it were, there would be no need for a superintendent or a board of education. I do favor extensive community involvement and want parents to take an interest in their schools. Parents should exert pressure for improvement in the schools, but it should be done through channels in an effort to make the system more responsible and more responsive. It is important for blacks to be sensitive to the needs of other blacks and not discriminate according to social class.

Q. As a former teacher, I experienced the hopelessness of a new teacher in not being prepared and at the same time disgust with the diehards who are holding on until retirement. There was no professional development for either kind of teacher.

A. A large number of our principals have no systematic plans or goals, so it is my intention to urge them to assess their teachers and to help them to do a better job. I am holding my assistant superintendents responsible for the performance of the principals and expect them to do the same. I am glad that many parents are helping the school administration by letting us know when teachers or principals are not performing effectively.

Q. How will you tackle the extensive absentee problem in the public schools?

A. Students know when attendance is not taken, and they will take advantage of such a situation. We are going to do intensive checking and get our pupils back into classes. We know that students will stay away from school, and so we are going to check up on them. Schools should report absences promptly to the parents and in that way let the students know that they care about them.

Q. You are under increasing pressure to distribute resources equally in the D.C. schools. How do you feel about that?

A. I want to convince Judge Skelly Wright that resources should be distributed unequally in proportion to the severity of academic retardation. Higher teacher salaries don't necessarily mean that there are better resources in a given school. In general, it would be my desire to distribute resources according to need.

Q. Your student population is also highly mobile. What can be done about that?

A. I think it is unfair to expect the schools to compensate for everything. We will try to help our students with food, clothing and essential services. We will try to improve our schools to the maximum extent possible, but it may not be possible to cure the mobility problem which is economically and socially inspired.

Q. Do you plan to make the Clark Plan a permanent part of your system or do you merely want to try it?

A. The Board of Education has laid down its policy, and I intend to carry it out. However, I do have some reservations about the Clark Plan and will make some changes as they are needed. I am pleased that the focus is on the basic academic skills--math and reading. The Clark Plan is a design for academic achievement and leaves many of the practical and operational aspects of its implementation to be developed by the school administration. For this reason, the school system must be organized in a manner that is consistent with sound management procedures, and considerable planning and coordination must take place.

(attendance: 71 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*
FIELD TRIP ON ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION
CATOCTIN MOUNTAIN STATE PARK
THURMONT, MARYLAND
APRIL 23 and 24, 1971

ESS participants assembled at the Old Senate Office Building on Friday afternoon, April 23. George E. Lowe of the Office of Environmental Education, Office of Education, explained that the intent of the field trip was to give each participant a feeling for environmental education by means of collecting and analyzing water samples from five sites along the Potomac River and its tributaries. Instructors for the field trip were to be students from a number of Maryland and Virginia high schools who, along with a few of their teachers, had voluntarily joined together to explore a common concern and interest in the preservation and proper utilization of the environment. Since much of the recent thrust for environmental education in the schools has originated with students, it seemed fitting that they should be the instructors.

This Washington area student-teacher effort to learn about the environment takes its inspiration from the Tilton Project, an environmental learning experiment in Tilton, New Jersey. Tilton's key innovation was a stress on environmental education as process education characterized by a problem-solving approach. Tilton strongly suggested that students, through such activities as monitoring a watershed or cleaning a lake, can perform valuable scientific functions of definite value to the local, State, and Federal agencies working for a cleaner, safer environment. In addition, the experiential, socially-involved education of Tilton indicated that students could play a definite role in shaping the direction and curriculum of American education.

Bernie Cherin, a program manager of WETA-TV, Channel 26, was introduced and ESS members learned that a documentary film would be made of our environmental education field trip. The student instructors then divided the ESS participants into five work groups. The task of each work group and its two student instructors was to examine the environmental-ecological condition of five sites in the Potomac watershed. Since the five sites ranged from Catoctin Mountain State Park to Lady Bird Park in Washington, a spectrum would emerge of the changing condition of the Potomac as it flowed from the mountains to the city of Washington.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

What transpired at the site on the Monocacy River was perhaps typical for these site investigations. Upon arrival at the Monocacy site, ESS members obtained two water samples. The first of these was used to determine the amount of free oxygen present in the water. A high free oxygen reading would indicate water capable of supporting large quantities of higher aquatic life. On the other hand, a low free oxygen reading would suggest conditions of pollution more favorable to bacteria. As the laboratory tests of this sample from the Monocacy later showed, the water had a very low free oxygen reading -- so low in fact -- that it was barely capable of supporting higher aquatic life. The second water sample collected was used in tests to determine the exact amount of bacteria present in the water. As it turned out, these tests indicated an extremely high bacteria count at the Monocacy site.

To collect an invetebrate sample, large nets were dipped into the bed of the River. From previous samplings along the Potomac watershed, over two hundred different species of invetebrate life had been identified, although the number found in the Monocacy sample on this day came no where near this total. Additional site tests included samples of the air and water temperature, a measurement of the water's velocity, and finally "eyeballing," observing with care all environmental conditions which might affect the condition of the River. With these samples and tests completed, the ESS group and their instructors left the Monocacy and headed for Catoctin Mountain State Park.

Catoctin Mountain State Park lies approximately thirty-five miles northwest of Washington in an area of low, rounded mountains which is characteristic of the Appalachian backbone. The Park is located in an area totally cut over for timber as late as the 'thirties. Yet, since then, the passage of time, the process of growth, and the abatement of the saw have largely obscured this old wound. A Job Corps center was established at Catoctin during the mid-sixties. When this center shut down in 1969 the land and facilities became the basis for the present State Park.

Upon their arrival at the Park, each of the five ESS groups proceded to the laboratory established in the old Job Corps gymnasium to continue analysis of the samples gathered at the test sites. A good portion of Friday evening as well as Saturday morning were eventually devoted to these laboratory tests. And although all laboratory tests were not completed by the end of the two-day field trip, enough data was gathered to support original suspicions of ever-increasing pollution as the Potomac flows from the mountains through the city of Washington.

Following a late Friday evening dinner, the Charles Lindberg film, the "Wisdom of Wilderness" sparked a rather free and open-ended discussion broadly centering on the inter-relationships among Nature, Man, Science, and technology. Although this discussion yielded no formal conclusions, most participants seemed to feel that man's ever-expanding scientific and technological prowess has now reached the stage where the questions of environmental use and protection have assumed a new meaning in the context of human survival itself. The evening ended with the ecological poetry of Mort Leeds of HUD.

The discussion on Saturday morning, centering on the Potomac Heritage '76 Project, crystalized much of the previous evening's and early morning's activities. The Potomac Heritage '76 Project proposes to clean-up and then to continue monitoring the Potomac watershed making it an ecological example for the entire nation in time for the bicentennial. Using many of the same tests and techniques employed by the ESS members in their site investigations, elementary and secondary school students from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia plus numerous community service organizations would have an opportunity to make a practical contribution to improving the quality of American life. At the same time, the organization and problem solving techniques developed by communities in implementing this environmental strategy would serve as benchmarks for other regions of the country as well as for the resolution of other community problems.

For American education, Lowe suggested that the Potomac Heritage '76 Project could help achieve a more relevant learning process. Inter-school cooperation and the application of student data in the effort for a cleaner environment, a multi-disciplinary approach to investigation and learning, and a meaningful integration of the curriculum from elementary through college were some of the educational benefits envisioned.

As the discussion shifted from a description of the Potomac Heritage '76 Project to the consideration of its implementation, ESS members investigated the role of the Federal government and specifically the potentialities of the Environmental Education Act (P.L. 91-516). The need for laboratory materials and teacher training in an environmental approach was emphasized. Questions were also raised as to the types of existing community organizations which would most likely contribute to a total community environmental effort.

Following this discussion, ESS participants again broke up into five work groups for the specific purpose of continued probing of this question of Federal participation. Among the many topics developed and debated were: the ways the Federal government could best foster and sustain concern for environmental education in the schools and the community and whether this was a legitimate Federal function, how an interest in environmental education could be realistically channeled into an effective environmental education program, and what forms of present Federal assistance were likely to prove most useful.

When the ESS participants left Catoctin Mountain State Park on Saturday afternoon, there were still no final answers to these types of questions, but there were many new ideas and opinions. These, in turn, seemed to reflect new degrees of interest and understanding in the intentions, potentials, and problems of environmental education.

--reported by David Osman

(32 participants)

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

REMARKS OF A PARTICIPANT

A FIELD TRIP TO SOUTH CAROLINA

Wednesday-Friday, January 13-15, 1971

Our visit to South Carolina State College at Orangeburg was a very important personal experience for me. I had the opportunity of discussing with aggressive and intellectually able young blacks for two and one-half hours the problems that they presently face. I came away from that meeting with two very strong impressions.

One - that these young blacks are still interested in working within the system; they still believe in the basic potential of our country to improve itself through the process of education. Second - their great frustration with the system in terms of finding what they consider to be personally rewarding jobs as something other than teachers when they graduate from this college. The young men expressed a variety of other concerns, but they did not have any specific racial overtones, and they were the concerns that one can find very commonly on many college campuses. I was also impressed with the bitterness with which these young men spoke of the Orangeburg massacre, and how little I personally know about that incident. It seems strange that we all know so well about Kent State, and about Jackson State to a lesser degree; speaking for myself, I knew very little about the Orangeburg incident, and these students were quick to point out that fact, with all of its racial implications.

The meeting during the evening with the faculty provided an interesting counterview to that of the students. This seemed to be a group of blacks who had made it, who had learned how to work within the system, and therefore were impressed with how much progress, and rightly so, they had made using that system. They had far fewer criticisms about it than did the students.

The trip to the Williamsburg Regional Manpower Training Center was impressive for the following reasons. The black workmen that I talked to on the job really seemed to feel that the community, white and black, rich and poor, had been actively involved in the planning of that particular facility. It did seem to me that it was an outgrowth of a cooperative public adventure in education. If this effort continues, it would seem to me that this facility might make a very great difference to the people in this geographical region, since it seems to be starting "where the people are at", rather than with some high-flown educator's concern of where they should be.

Our meeting with Superintendent Fennell of Williamsburg County was particularly interesting. The highlights for me included seeing in operation an actual unitary school system which only a year ago had been a dual system. It seemed to be operating quite well as far as the educ ational part of it was concerned. The young children seemed to be getting on quite well, together. This was not apparently as true for the teachers, both white and black. It will take years of working together to break down those barriers. The number of dismissals, demotions, or threats of dismissal seemed to be a concern of the black teachers.

I am impressed, having read the evaluation with which we were provided on their Title I kindergarten program. They obviously put a high priority on planning and evaluation.

The most disappointing part of this visit was seeing the closed black high school.

Our meeting with Governor Robert McNair was interesting and informative, but for some reason I did not feel that many of us got meaningfully involved in the issues with the governor, and I am not sure why that was true.

Our meeting with Mr. Robert Davis, chairman of the South Carolina Advisory Committee, was a rather stimulating meeting from my point of view. The impressions that I had gained for the last two days were confirmed. For the school systems in the south to have survived the opening of school this fall with as little violence and disruption as happened is a rather impressive piece of business, and wittingly or unwittingly, the citizens of South Carolina like Mr. Davis played an important part in that situation. I believe he did make an honest and sincere effort to keep the public schools in South Carolina open, and to support what he called quality education. Several members of our group later indicated to me that they believe "quality education" is a code word of the South which means "to keep them as segregated as possible." That may, in fact, be true. However, I believe that we have passed the day when code words are effective, and that people like Mr. Davis are looked to by the majority of citizenry of any state as a symbol of leadership in a particular direction, even if the leader himself personally was not totally committed to that particular point of view.

--Gilbert Austin
Special Assistant
Office of the Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS IN AMERICA"

Wednesday evening, January 12, 1972

with

Timothy Affleck and Allen Graubard

Dr. Graubard began the presentation with a general discussion about alternative schools. He felt that alternative schools have been established by a growing constituency of persons dissatisfied with the present school system. The roots of the movement stretch back to the progressive school movement of 50 years ago. Ideas expressed by John Dewey and others were never fully implemented so that the goals of progressive reformers were not accomplished. Real experiments were tried in progressive principles at private schools such as Fort Lincoln or Fieldston.

The real drive for free schools began in the early sixties when people began to insist on taking control of their institutions. About 20 new schools were established in 1965-66. Their basic principles could be stated as an opposition to uniform curriculum and to the rigid training, scheduling certification requirements of the public system which tend to limit a child's basic creative drive. This year 200 free schools were founded. The schools stress spontanaeity and discount "success" oriented goals. Graubard discussed three types of free schools as most common.

1. The Elementary Parent Co-op.
   A small (30-40 students) nongraded cooperative school the example of Summerhill was used.
2. The Black Community School.
   Related to the freedom school movement -- to pose an alternative to the white dominated public school.
3. The Experimental High School.
   Unlike the first two this type is student and staff organized and is not parent initiated. The school emphasizes complete participation, equality and community involvement.

Graubard stated that in all of the schools there is a strong element of the "counter culture," i.e. that education cannot be isolated from the "big picture" of society.

Graubard went on to discuss more of the philosophical roots of the free school movement:

1. Most public schools are not oriented to being concerned about basic human needs of the student.
2. Free schools depend on self-motivation, making learning fun. Students should be encouraged to develop their own studyplans.
3. Schools should be small, intimate communities.

Graubard also sketched a general plan of action which most free schools take. Planning begins after a group member has read an author such as John Holt or John Dennison. Buildings are arranged for and a tuition scale is established, if necessary. Tuition is usually very low ($0-800 per year). Graubard emphasized that there is a great deal of chaos at each step. The schools tend to be self-conscious about their problems. Money problems are always serious but participants are willing to take the risk.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Tim Affleck's discussion centered on types of free schools. The elementary schools (Parent Cooperatives) can be broken down into two types. The largest group is middle class initiated by persons who think their children can be better educated out of the traditional mold. The second smaller group is from the "counter culture" and tends to have expanded political views of the role of schools.

Two types of high schools have emerged; working class and ones initiated by college students and or high school students who do not like the public system. The working class schools, composed of drop-outs or push-outs from the public system, tend to place a heavier emphasis on traditional measures of success.

Affleck also discussed institutional problems facing the free schools. The primary one seems to be getting the members of the community (parents, teachers and students) oriented to a self-motivated system. All are used to the traditional system and these are problems of transition. The lack of formal structure also present some problems. The motivation for establishing a class should be from the teacher's point of view that the teacher likes the subject and knows it and from the student's point of view that the student wants to learn.

Statements

Byron Hansen, of the Chief State School Officers Association, stated that he felt that public schools were working for the goals expressed by our speakers. He also stated that we must apply "accountability" to all new types of schools which will develop in the future.

Stanley MacFarland of NEA stated he felt that if most teachers had their chance that they would structure their classes more like the free schools. Graubard agreed and said he felt most teachers get into the profession for good reasons.

Questions

1. Do some parents withdraw their children from free schools? Why? Yes, parents who never really believed in the school or who feel that their kids are not progressing. Small size in this case can be a limiting factor (i.e. in-breeding, students do not have contact with a diverse cross-section of groups)
2. What are some of the differences in "process?" There are two areas, A. identification -- students see the lives of adults in the system as much more relevant; B. existential learning -- formal learning is only a small part of the process kids are in an environment.
3. What do the free schools think about the credentialing system for teachers? Credentialing must be rethought. Teaching is a human activity. much of the training for teachers is in classroom management; subject expertise does not guarantee an ability to communicate.

4. How long do kids stay in free schools?
   Elementary children stay longer. An average stay may be two years. Many high school students go back to public schools to organize other students.
5. How do colleges rate free school kids?
   The more prestigious the school, the more they want free school kids. Sluggish kids are failed by both schools.
6. How much are alternative schools for the parents?
   The goal of free schools should be "that parents do not lay their trip on the kids." Choices always have to be made, but in a free school choices are made openly and honestly.
7. What are the risks for a free school student in relation to the credentials he needs?
   For middle class kids, which are a high percentage of the free school population, the risk is not large. That is, there is no relationship between achievement in school and in society (Graubard mentioned The Great Training Robbery). The goals of the "establishment are not the goals of the free schools."
8. What are some of the unsolved problems of the free schools?
   A. not taking damaged kids
   B. adults using the free schools for their own purposes.
   C. free schools collapse -- public schools can't fail, there are 60,000 teachers in New York City and last year only 7 were dismissed for incompetence.
9. What federal laws could help the movement?
   A. more money
   B. using the free schools as working educational laboratories
10. How does the free school maintain its small size?
   There is a difference between lower and high schools. High schools want more kids for diversity. Selection process in lower schools work from parent's boards.
11. What is the oldest free school?
   The left fringe of the progressive movement founded Louis Waddoms or Clay Mounti -- during the 40's. Real free schools date from 1965 (Pacific High School). The black schools started earlier. They tend to be more structured, but they become involved with the same kind of social "raps" many evolved from the "freedom schools" in the South during the civil rights efforts of the early 1960's.

--Reported by Jonathan Brown
(63 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY   INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"SERRANO VS. PRIEST: MILESTONE OR MILLSTONE FOR URBAN SCHOOL FINANCE?"

Tuesday, February 22, 1972

Joel Berke of Syracuse University and Brookings presented the paper to which the discussants reacted. Mr. Berke's paper covered 1) the background of the school finance cases, 2) the problem of inequitable finance to which the cases were addressed, 3) the gap between the problem and the remedy and 4) the solutions

1) Background The first case - McGinness vs. Ogilvie - was unsuccessful and premature because it argued educational expenditures had to be distributed according to needs. The court ruled this standard to be non-justiciable. Later successful cases were based on the argument (most commonly associated with Coons, Sugarman, and Clune) that school finance systems which vary on the basis of wealth are unconstitutional - a negative standard.

2) The School Finance Problem The basic problem, according to Mr. Berke, is that wealthier districts have lower tax efforts and yet higher per pupil expenditures. Disparities in per pupil expenditures become inequities when related to some concept of educational need. The need is greater in large cities for three reasons" a) a higher portion of students are from low-income families and thus have greater educational needs; b) higher costs of purchasing services and maintaining plant in cities due to "militant unionism", vandalism, etc., and c) the municipal overburden which sees cities spend a higher portion of their income on public services than do suburbs, but suburbs spend a higher portion on education. The resultant higher cost of education in urban areas when matched with a financing system based on local wealth creates inequities because the distribution of financial resources for education is not related to need.

3) School finance inequities and the Court decision The Courts have simply said the quality of education shall not be a function of wealth, except of the State as a whole. The Court has not said educational spending must be related to need. The Court's standard can be met through three mechanisms: a) full state assumption, b) power equalizing (allowing districts to choose their tax rates, but guaranteeing a specific per pupil revenue for each mill levied) and c) redistricting. None of these

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

measures will guarantee educational funds will be distributed according to need. In fact, there is reason to believe cities could be worse off (if under full state assumption, states distributed funds on equal per pupil basis and if increased state funding were financed through regressive or proportional taxes. Using these assumptions, Berke found that, in 13 cities investigated under a full state assumption model, tax effort rose in ten, and expenditures rose only in seven.

4) Solutions Any efforts to find solution to problem of educational inequities must look at more than simply prohibiting educational finance systems which are a function of local wealth. It must also consider: a) the means of financing any statewide system (should be progressive); b) cost differentials in urban, suburban, and rural areas; c) additional costs needed to educate low-income children; d) tax base per total population rather than solely per student; and e) total tax effort rather than solely tax effort for education.

Several discussants then commented:

Sarah Carey of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights: Under law termed Serrano only one step in the evolution of a constitutional standard. Serrano's importance was that for the first time, education was declared a fundamental interest and the Court came up with a negative standard. It will be difficult to develop a positive standard based on need until the concept of need is better conceptualized and until we are able to generate data necessary to operationalize the concept. Ms. Carey concluded by observing that it would be a terrible mistake to initiate a major federal contribution towards educational finance unless states deal with the inequitable distribution of resources within states.

Norman Karsh of the Commission on School Finance next stated that progress has been made: the existence of disparities is no longer in question, but is a starting point. Karsh then indicated that the next logical research endeavor would be the development of a cost of education index and the identification and quantification of need variables so that educational need indicies could be constructed.

Arthur Levin of the Potomac Institute next commented that the problem was primarily political rather than educational and will have to be solved through legislative action. Any remedy will require much more money, including a major federal contribution.

Betsy Levin of the Urban Institute then discussed questions left unanswered by Serrano:

1) Is power equalization unconstitutional (since it would allow variations in per pupil expenditure based upon geography) ?

2) Serrano did not concern itself with capital outlay, but will states ultimately be required to assume all capital construction costs ?

3) Is it the unequal levels of educational spending which are unconstitutional or the unequal tax burdens ?

4) What is meant by equality -- equal dollars, equal services, or equal educational outputs?

5) What degree of disparities, however defined, will the courts allow?

Miss Levin emphasized that it is not the extreme cases, but the averages which attention should be focused on. In all cases the Urban Institute had investigated, central cities were spending more per pupil than were the suburbs. However, there was great variation among the suburbs.

There were almost no differences among school districts within a state on per-pupil non-instructional educational expenditures. Most of the disparities that did exist were due to teachers' salary levels.

Miss Levin concluded by suggesting there was little likelihood that state legislatures would move towards state assumption of education costs through a formula taking into account higher cost in urban areas and the higher cost of educating disadvantaged children. During 1968-69, only seven states had such a formula. She saw power equalizing as a more likely approach, but concluded that she was pessimistic about the likelihood of state legislative action in the absence of federal incentives.

The final discussant, Phyllis Myers of City Magazine, emphasized that education problems will not be solved unless whatever funds are available are spent more effectively. Additional funds, all of which go into increased teacher salaries and pensions, will not guarantee better education. That problem won't be solved, she concluded, until schools are forced, in some way, to become more accountable.

Questions were then addressed to the speaker and the various discussants. Mr. Berke was asked to set forth preconditions of massive federal aid. He listed three: 1) full funding of the present ESEA Title I program, 2) the development by states of education output measures and evaluation of education output through tests, and 3) the tying of federal aid to the elimination of gross disparities among school districts within states.

--reported by Hal Wolman
(attendance: 66 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
"AFTER RODRIGUEZ: WHAT NEXT IN SCHOOL FINANCE POLICIES?"
December 6, 1972

STEPHEN BROWNING, LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW, speaking first, traced the history of four relevant court cases leading up to the Rodriguez decision:

Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), in which the Court held that racial segregation on public transportation facilities was not unlawful so long as "equal" facilities were provided for each race (the "separate but equal" doctrine);

Sweatt v. Painter (1950), which rejected the "separate but equal" doctrine in the area of public education facilities, holding that the exclusion of a Black law student from the segregated University of Texas Law School deprived him of certain intangible benefits related to the study of law, even though the physical facilities of Black law schools in Texas may have been of equal quality;

Brown v. Board of Education (1954), holding that because of detrimental psychological pressures upon a Black child resulting from compulsory school segregation, "separate" educational facilities are inherently unequal, and such segregation is unconstitutional;

McInnes v. Ogilvie (1968), where the Court held there is no constitutional requirement that public school expenditures be made only on the basis of pupils' educational needs without regard to the financial strength of local school districts.

With these cases as background, Mr. Browning turned to the Rodriguez case. Whereas the plaintiffs in the four background cases asked the court to award specific remedies, the plaintiff in Rodriguez sought only a declaratory judgment on the question of whether the quality of a child's education in the public schools of a State may be a function of wealth other than the wealth of the state as a whole.

The plaintiffs in Rodriguez are arguing that education is a "fundamental interest" in the same constitutional sense as voting rights, the right to travel and the right to counsel. Because of the fundamental interest there can be no justification for unequal classifications.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The argument before the Supreme Court centered mainly on the question whether Texas had a compelling interest to justify the method by which schools are financed. Texas argued that the issue of local control justified their system of school finance and that this represented a compelling State interest because local control is preserved by the present system.

Mr. Browning pointed out that it is important to note that there are a variety of types of suits which must be distinguished:

1) With regard to plaintiffs - suits have been brought on behalf of children, taxpayers and public officials.
2) With regard to courts - cases have been brought in both federal and state courts. (This is important to note since, if Rodriquez is reversed, state suits could still continue. If Rodriquez is reversed because the Supreme Court determines that education is not a fundamental interest, the state could still conceivably say that education was a fundamental interest in the state, as was done in the Serrano decision.)
3) With regard to the basic theories - there are federal equal protection suits, state equal protection suits, and suits involving state education provisions.

Mr. Browning concluded by discussing some of the implications of the pending decision. If Rodriquez is affirmed, Mr. Browning concluded that there would be enormous legislative activity at both the state and federal levels. Of course, there are a number of ways in which the decision could be affirmed, and if it is not affirmed broadly, then there are obvious questions about what implications it will have vis-a-vis other state cases.

Mr. Browning pointed out that Rodriquez does not deal with the entire question of inequality among the states. He felt that this would be constitutionally difficult to argue since education is a state function and not a federal function. In addition, the case does not examine the question of inequality within districts.

MR. GEORGE LIEBMANN, ATTORNEY, in response to the question, "After Rodriquez What Next in School Finance Policies" has answered, "more of the same." In effect, he has presented the case that we will continue to have a system of school finance in which local governments are not prevented from taxing and spending for education and one in which there will be no penalty on the more prosperous districts.

Mr. Liebmann bases his premise on three grounds:
1) Legal. It is highly unlikely that Rodriquez will be affirmed or at least affirmed on any broad grounds. The legal obstacles are too formidable. First, there are prior decisions by the Supreme Court (McInnis and Burruss) which are almost indistinguishable. Second, there are recent decisions by

the Supreme Court not to embroil itself in the allocation of welfare benefits and housing. Third, even the more recent lower court decisions on state school finance systems are sharply divided. (ex. Maryland) Finally, there is a noted failure of the decided cases to square with long established constitutional doctrine relating to limitations on the roles of courts as to questions of public finance. Further, Mr. Liebmann pointed out that the hope that a declaratory judgment will be enough and that legislatures will acquiesce to the entire question of enforcement of these decisions is an idle dream.

2) Educational and Economic Policy. The immediate short run result of Rodriquez would be dramatic increases in state school costs. In fact, more than $8 billion would be necessary nationally to equalize spending levels to the ninetieth percentile. Furthermore, although proponents of these changes assume states would adopt a progressive state income tax, in reality this will not necessarily happen as many states already have high state income taxes. Rather, it is highly likely that the enormous costs of Rodriquez would be allocated among state taxpayers on an essentially regressive basis. This is due to political reasons as well as the fact that the most progressive tax, the income tax, has already been preempted by the Federal Government.

With regard to the "emotional fuel" behind this litigation--the desire to elevate the educational standards of the poor, particularly in urban areas--there are a variety of studies which demonstrate that this most probably will not be the result. A study by the U.S. Office of Education entitled "Finances of Large-City School Systems - a Comparative Analysis," found that most large cities have above average per capita assessments due to the large concentrations of commercial and industrial property. At the same time, they have below average tax efforts for education due to the fact that the fiscal problems of large cities come from all the other services they need to provide. Thus, the study concludes that if all the states collected local funds for education and redistributed them on an equal funds per pupil basis, most urban school systems would receive less funds. Professor Joel Burke of Syracuse, in a study commissioned by the Mondale Committee, found that if property taxes were replaced by state school property taxes most large cities would suffer. Thus, the chief effect of the Serrano-Rodriquez rule would more than likely be the pouring of vast sums of money into rural areas with low costs and few social and educational problems.

It is said sometimes that states would rethink their formulas and skew benefits to urban districts, but Liebmann argues that they are free to do this now and that it is highly unlikely that suburban representatives would vote special funds for cities when their own expenditures were being held down.

Liebmann argues that another major effect of the Rodriquez-Serrano decision would be expanded benefits for teachers and that this leads to the obvious question of whether there is a direct relation between education, spending and accomplishment. Liebmann feels that improvement in education would most appropriately be achieved by reallocation of existing funds or particularized new appropriations and this would be discouraged by the Rodriguez decision. What will be lost if additional funds are directed at general purpose equalization is the exploration of new methods and the alleviation of the social problems that breed educational failure.

Looking at the purely fiscal issues, Liebmann made several observations about the property tax. Proponents of these decisions claim that they have nothing to do with the value of the property tax. They claim that full state funding is not a necessary result and that there is the option of district power equalizing. But Liebmann argues that this is an illusion because district power equalizing presupposes an accurate and uniform measure of district taxing power. This cannot be insured without utilizing state rather than local assessment of real property. The property tax is a good local tax and would be a bad state tax, Liebmann argues, because it is impossible to equalize over a broad geographic area the principles of assessment. Generally a shift away from property taxation would be bad. Commercially, it would confer a windfall on many industries. As for the residential property tax, other than the need to reform it to take account of the special needs of the elderly and very poor, it is not grossly unfair, as has been claimed. There is no reason to believe, Liebmann argues, that the distribution of even residential property is regressive in relation to income classes.

3) Ideology. Underlying this case is the premise that education should be a function of parental wealth. This premise threatens private education and parental supplements. Also, as a practical matter, the effect of restricting expenditures in suburban schools increases the attractiveness of private education and decreases political support for public education. Second, an effect of these cases is to give impetus to greater state and national influence over schools and to diminish local and family influence. Finally, to say that permissible inequalities may not result from differences between the local units to which the state delegates authority flies in the face of established doctrine about the doctrine of authority.

RICHARD MERRITT, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, commenting briefly on the Rodriguez decision as it affects state legislatures, emphasized the fact that legislatures will not necessarily be straitjacketed by these court decisions as Mr. Liebmann seemed to indicate. He went on to point out that whatever decisions are made by legislatures in response to Serrano-Rodriguez, they must recognize the special burdens of the large urban areas. With regar to the entire question of local control, Mr. Merritt stated that he did not feel that local control was dependent on local tax raising and that local control can and should remain regardless of the direction taken by state legislatures with regard to school finance. He also brought up the question of the need for federal commitment and reiterated that the federal government must increase its contribution to education.

ROBERT GOETTEL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE PROGRAM, noted that the "laundry list" of issues relating to the Serrano and Rodriguez decisions is long and complex and there is a great deal of misinformation, but that does not mean we shouldn't move ahead with what we are doing. This was the main thesis behind Dr. Goettel's remarks. The system is unfair and it needs to be changed. This is not to say, however, that all of the present proposals are equitable. Dr. Goettel pointed out that he does not necessarily believe that full state assumption is the answer. He also agrees that there are problems with district power equalizing. In essence, then, there are a vast range of solutions and these recent court decisions have created a new climate.

Dr. Goettel agreed with Mr. Merritt that large urban areas will not necessarily lose out under any formula devised by the state. Cities have clout and they will use it to their benefit.

The courts are in this for impetus, Dr. Goettel concluded. The results will be played out in the political process. And these results will create a system of school finance that is more equitable for all concerned.

During the question-and-answer period a variety of major issues relating to school finance were touched upon. Included among them were:
1) Does money really make a difference?
2) Would the Rodriguez decision lead to the same contentions in the areas of police, sewers, etc? Here both Mr. Browning and Mr. Liebmann agreed that these other areas are not constitutionally fundamental, although Mr. Liebmann went on to say that he did believe that this issue would be raised with regard to health and welfare.
3) Is a minimum education constitutionally required?
4) How many states really are examining how to implement these decisions beyond just equalizing expenditures?

--reported by Judy Helms
(66 participants)

PART III

VIEWPOINTS: ON RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL FUTURES

Federal commitments to educational research have added a wealth of information about how people learn. Unfortunately, much of this research--and particularly its public policy implications--has not been effectively disseminated to those in the Federal Government who determine educational policy.

ESS serves as a supplementary information channel, attempting to "connect" educational researchers and policy-makers. Our programs have featured discussion with provocative educational researchers and site visits to leading educational research centers. We have also focused on particular educational experiments which may point the way toward the schools of the future.....

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166

Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING," JULY 8, 1970

(attendance: 84 persons)

Charles Blaschke, President of Education Turnkey Systems, headed the speakers' panel. Other panel members were James Gillis, President and Chairman of the Board of Educasting-QED, Inc.; Mick Donnelley, former Dorsett Education Systems' Project Director for the Texarkana dropout prevention project; John Wilson, Assistant Director, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity, who has responsibility for that agency's performance contracting project.

Blaschke called performance contracting a "catalyst for school system reform." In our concern with educational technology itself, he said, we have neglected the political and managerial reform in the schools needed to put technology to work. Performance contracting ensures the effective utilization of technology.

Performance contracting, Blaschke explained, usually involves a school system contracting for a specified raise in a student group's achievement. If the students don't achieve to the standards set by contract, the contractor either isn't paid or is penalized financially. Performance contracts to date have been limited to math, reading, and skill development. The exception is a Dallas contract for increasing achievement motivation in vocational education.

The company demonstrates a new learning system the first year, raising achievement levels a certain amount in a certain amount of time. The second year, the company offers the school board to guarantee similar improvements on a 90 percent basis, provided the school board makes certain changes. These might include training teachers as instructional managers or instituting a performance accounting system. The company might offer use of its technology without these changes on a, say, 40 percent guarantee basis.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefits of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Most educational decisions, Blaschke contended, are made on political, social, or economic grounds, not on educational merit. Performance contracting can reduce the political stakes for educational decisions. For instance, white parents often fear that integration will bring low-achieving black students into the classroom, "slowing everyone else down." A performance contract can take low-achieving black students slated for desegregation, bring them up to par, then integrate them fully.

Blaschke noted that performance contracting asks policy-makers to set standards and not to make programmatic decisions. The contractor's confidence in his system can be measured by the percentage of his guarantee and his costs. He foresaw the possibility of industry negotiating directly with teachers' unions, perhaps arranging to pay teachers according to their productivity.

Wilson discussed OEO's performance contracting experiment. OEO decided to support the experiment when it became evident that school districts are beginning to look seriously at performance contracting. The concept has not yet been well tested, and since it involves a major change, OEO thought it was worth looking into. He listed the elements OEO feels necessary for conducting a major social experiment:

1. the involvement of a flexibile, entrepreneurial organization, able to act quickly;
2. a sizable consolidation of resources, such as \$5-7 million for a 2-3 year period; and
3. a clear specification of objectives and the variables to be studied.

Twenty-one districts will participate in the OEO program, 18 on a performance contracting basis, each working with 1 of 6 companies. They will use a broad range of techniques and technologies. In three districts, the contractor will be the teachers' union, or a group of teachers. Twenty-five thousand students will be involved. Some projects will use technology, some incentives and some both technology and incentives. Control groups will be groups in the regular educational process. "Comparison groups" of students in the same school as project children will be looked at, too, to note spillover effects. Participating students will be post-tested one year after returning to the regular program. Students will be in grades 1-3 and 7-9.

Blaschke added that school systems have no standards by which to judge one contractor's guarantee against another; he hoped OEO's work would help develop such standards.

Gillis spoke as a representative of a for-profit corporation. He pointed out that only about two percent of the $50 billion yearly expenditure on education goes for instructional materials. With volume, a company can make money without volume, it can't.

Gillis said he is "not enthralled" with the turnkey concept, since he fears schools may be right back where they started when a contractor pulls out. He did see performance contracting as a chance to demonstrate a fully synthesized learning system. He warned that if such systems were ever seriously put to use, nobody could afford them. He said this was already a problem in performance contracting--school systems are finding they can't afford the cost of a successful effort.

Gillis thought performance contracting's major contribution has been encouraging a lot of people to look at educational output for the first time.

Donnelley sketched some practical problems encountered in the Texarkana experiment. Tests were a serious obstacle, since standardized tests didn't reflect the instructional objectives of the school system. Also, some students purposely did poorly on the exit tests so they could stay in the program because of its attractive features.

If you're interested in performance contracting, Donnelley commented, you must be serious about individualized instruction.

On the relationship between contractor and school project people, Donnelley said that many small school districts won't have anyone with a sophisticated planning or related background for contractors to deal with.

Donnelley warned that private enterprise will be quickly disenchanted with performance contracting. Firms in a hurry to prove their point and make some money may also cut corners.

Zangwill (HEW) led off the question and answer period by asking the panel if legislation and guidelines should be revised to allow for performance contracting. Wilson cautioned that since the results are not yet in on performance contracting, it is too early to move ahead with legislation.

Blaschke commented that performance contracting sets up a different incentive structure than the regular school program: both teacher and student are rewarded if the student achieves, and the school system is rewarded if it reduces cost over time.

There are now few incentives for schools to become more output-oriented. He suggested that Federal education aid might be allotted according to pupil's grade level deficiencies. We should test schools for student output, and if the schools don't produce, we could stop their funds.

Blum (OMB) wanted clarification of the elements of performance contracting. Is it synonomous with incentives and instructional technology? He didn't see it that way; one could write a performance contract with teachers, and it wouldn't necessarily involve either incentives or innovations. Wilson agreed; he felt performance contracting entailed carefully stated objectives and individualization. Zangwill saw performance contracting as a process in which two separate groups mutually decide on objectives.

Blaschke reiterated his belief in the need for performance contracting, if bonuses and incentives do increase student achievement. With competitive bidding, the contractor will install his instructional system for a lower price than normal.

Skelly (Great Cities Research Council) said big city school systems may be the major consumers of performance contracting. He looked on the concept as a "hopeful enterprise," which might lead to desperately needed reform. He said he was aware of pitfalls, though. He thought safeguards will be needed, particularly to protect the school systems. He hoped that contractors will work to institutionalize new instructional patterns, and that school systems will try to learn from the contractors.

Frankel (HEW) asked what major issues would arise over the next two or three years if performance contracting is to suceed. He wondered how the technique would avoid creating a system to teach kids to take tests, and how it would help kids develop in ways that would help them to cope with civilization, not just increase one grade level in math. Blaschke answered that the testing industry is getting uncomfortable about the narrowness of its instruments.

Shiller (OEO) agreed that preoccupation with tests can be dangerous. But if performance contracting can give kids basic reading and math skills early in the school years, both the kids and teachers will be freed to concentrate on other things later on. Frankel argued that reinforcing teacher behavior to teach basic skills would give them less incentive to attend to other areas. Blaschke made a plea for giving kids a foundation. Frankel agreed, as long as they were talking about bringing kids up to basic skill levels. Once beyond that point, he said he was worried about the effects of performance contracting's reinforcement system.

Shiller and Gillis talked about testing. Shiller described OEO's testing system for the performance contracting system, mentioning that 25 percent of the contractors' money will be based on "criterion referenced tests." Classroom relevance of the tests would be certified. Gillis pointed out that some performance evaluation can be behaviorally based, rather than "paper based."

Blaschke concluded from his experience in reviewing performance contract proposals that all those involved agree on what works in teaching basic skills: incentives, and learner control of his own instruction.

Lillywhite (CSSO) asked Wilson why OEO is selecting the contractors for the schools in its experiment. Wilson explained that OEO wanted to assure as broad a range of techniques as possible for experimental purposes. Blaschke added that the school systems had no incentive to negotiate hard since they were using Federal funds. Since OEO was a party to negotiations, it could protect the government's financial interest.

Butler (OE) challenged Wilson's early claim that OEO would be able to control any Hawthorne effect. Wilson agreed that one can't bias the results substantially. You run into the Hawthorne effect in any social science experiment, he said.

Arnstein (OSTI) returned to Blaschke's earlier comment that the Texarkana project helped the district deal with desegregation. What percentage of kids in the project were integrated into the schools, she asked. Did some schools choose to join the project because it gave them the chance to delay desegregation? Blaschke answered that some Negro children came to the project out of fear that they couldn't make it in an integrated school. Zangwill thought performance contracting can help integration along, by coupling desegregation with quality education as an incentive.

Blaschke suggested that equal educational opportunity as a goal is obsolete; the goal should be "equity of results."

Lester (OE) wanted to know the relationship between the National Assessment projects and performance contracting. Blaschke did not know if students in performance contracting schools had been tested.

Frankel asked where performance contracting would be five years from now. Blaschke thought it would be dead, since a number of learning systems would have been proven and companies would no longer need performance contracting to sell their techniques.

He emphasized that performance contracting is no end in itself; it is useful for validating new learning systems. Gillis disagreed with that projection, maintaining that five years from now suburban systems would be getting their first performance contracts.

Menges (HEW) asked if performance contracting is being used for military training. Zangwill cited DOD's background in performance contracting. He talked about the difficulty of negotiating in this area. When experts in this kind of negotiating leave and school systems have to take over, there are bound to be problems. He mentioned HEW's interest in contracting with Rand to bring special negotiating expertise to educational performance contracting.

The last question dealt with finding sources for performance contracting: will local funds eventually be committed to this, or will school districts only go into it with Federal money? It's just done with Federal funds now, Gillis said, but once the idea gets going we'll probably see the redeployment of local resources. He said that many school systems could both improve output and run at a profit if they were managed differently. Blaschke expected that no school system would use local resources for performance contracting while the Federal bill remains. Ultimately, he concluded, the willingness of school districts to go into performance contracting would depend on whether there is incentive locally for spending its money that way.

--Reported by Holly Knox

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* "EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND R&D CENTERS: THEIR ROLE IN AMERICAN EDUCATION"

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

(attendance: 61 persons)

A resource panel was composed of 14 representatives of regional educational laboratories and research and development centers from all sections of the country. Ben Carmichael, Director of the Appalachian Educational Laboratory in Charleston, West Virginia, introduced the panel presentation by posing three broad questions: What are regional labs and research and development centers? What sort of work do they conduct? What are the major problems in research and development in education which they address?

Lawrence Fish of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon noted that regional labs are composed of components such as organization, specialized personnel facilities, and working relationships which have as their overall goal the development and production of new educational materials. The regional labs depend on networks of institutions--universities and public schools--within a region. Lab personnel are interdisciplinary teams working together to solve a given educational problem, bringing together the interests of people involved in research and classroom work. The relationships between universities and public schools result in a system for the assessment of problems, the design of solutions, and the development and testing of materials. The cycle of design, testing and redesign is conceived to provide quality materials for classroom use.

Herbert Klausmeier of the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning in Madison, Wisconsin, stressed the similarity in purpose between labs and R&D centers, adding that the main difference between them was that R&D centers are more involved than labs in the generation of new research--principles, theory, and new learning systems. He emphasized the need for sufficient autonomy from the existing educational system in R&D centers to assure the development of sound innovations in educational techniques.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Klausmeier presented the tentative results of a recently completed survey of eight R&D centers and 14 regional labs, analyzing their activities under the headings of pre-school and elementary programs, higher education programs and organization and administration activities. The survey revealed, for example, that 10 reading and language programs in 30 states are being conducted in 664 districts serving 183,306 students. Some 16 teaching programs in 46 states and 930 districts are serving a population of 74,351. Likewise, 10 organization and administration programs in 35 states and 525 districts are serving a population of 458,380.

John Hemphill of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, concluded the panel presentation by stressing the tangible contributions of the labs and R&D centers to the development of educational material. He added, however, that there are substantial problems in disseminating the materials to local districts for use in the classroom. New materials packages which are developed in labs and R&D centers are prohibitively expensive to local districts by the time they are marketed through commercial firms.

Asked for more elaboration of the problem of marketing materials, Hemphill replied that local districts have too little money to devote to experimentatal projects, adding that such projects involve substantial increases in instructional costs which cannot be absorbed by most districts.

Asked for examples of how high costs affected the dissemination of new materials, Hemphill cited the example of a mini-course providing instruction for teachers on the conduct of classroom discussions which utilizes video tape equipment. Teachers who used the package were enthusiastic about it. However, the cost of the package, when marketed through the private sector, was prohibitively high--about $1500. The implementation of such a program would involve add-on costs to a school district which are difficult, if not impossible, to absorb. Private marketing adds about 80 percent to the cost of the package, yet it is essential to use private concerns because only they can provide the broad dissemination necessary for wide use.

Asked to what extent regional labs serve the educational needs peculiar to the regions in which they are located, Robert Dentler of the Center for Urban Education in New York City, replied that since program changes initiated in 1968 have taken effect, requiring extensive field testing and dissemination, regional needs have been emphasized less and less until, at the present time, such an emphasis occurs in only a few cases.

Asked whether the consolidated administration of Titles III and IV of ESEA, which was proposed at one point, would be desirable or undesirable, the panelists responded that such a change would be very desirable. They recommended, in addition, that provision be made in Titles I and II of ESEA for the purchase of instructional packages developed in labs and R&D centers. This, they observed, would increase the capability of local districts to purchase their products.

The discussion returned to the subject of the marketing of laboratory instructional products. In response the question of why instructional packages could not be printed by the Federal government, it was observed that the commercial publishers have always resisted such a possibility as a threat to their business interests.

Edwin Hindsman of the Southwest Educational Development Lab in Austin, Texas, added that effective marketing would have to be preceded by a loosening of state textbook adoption requirements. He noted also that marketing is greatly enhanced by the involvement of local and state education agencies in the development of the materials.

Asked where the emphasis has been with regional labs as between development and dissemination, Hemphill responded that labs seem to be shifting increasingly away from development toward dissemination. He, too, emphasized that dissemination can be greatly improved by the involvement of local and state agencies, in product development.

A participant observed that it was the interest and expectation of Congress that local agencies would turn to labs with Federal program monies for the purchase of materials, etc. The panelists responded that, while this is happening in some isolated instances, it is not yet a matter of general practice. They also recommended that labs be made eligible recipients for Federal grants under such programs as the Education Professions Development Act.

Asked to delineate their criticisms of Federal involvement in educational research and development, the panelists noted the following concerns:

- --the uncertainty of funding levels and program priorities
- --the lack of control over the funds available
- --Federal pressures and cross-pressures which force too much involvement in short-run inadequate solutions to educational problems where long-run, effective solutions are needed.

Asked if labs and R&D centers had had much success in securing non-Federal support, Hemphill replied that foundations had not been a generous source of support because of their feeling that the Federal government had pre-empted the field; income from royalties on commercially marketed products is still very small; and state and local education agencies have not shown a willingness to pick up R&D activities which are dropped by the Federal government.

The discussion turned once more to the problems of dissemination and marketing. Marc Tucker of the Educational Development Center in Newton, Massachusetts, cited the example of the PSSC physics programs for high schools which was developed at a cost of $7 million to the Federal government. The investment has been returned over twice to the Federal treasury. He contended that only the Federal government can undertake a development cost of that magnitude, adding that private publishers cannot afford the risk. Furthermore, the Federal government stands to recoup its investment. He suggested that one possible solution to the dissemination and marketing problem might be a Federal guarantee for private risks incurred in marketing lab-developed products. Such a guarantee could be financed from a Treasury revolving fund.

The discussion ended on a supportive note with a mutual recognition of the benefits and shortcomings of current Federal research and development in education.

--Reported by Richard Elmore

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "MUSEUMS AS INSTITUTIONAL ALTERNATIVES TO FORMAL EDUCATION"

DECEMBER 16, 1970

S. DILLON RIPLEY

Secretary, The Smithsonian Institution

(attendance: 60 persons)

Dr. Ripley presented a brief history of the Smithsonian Building and Institution in which he noted that the Smithsonian had served as a "school" and center of scholarship for a number of years. He went on to propose that the museum is the forerunner of the university as an institution and that museums may yet show the way to universities in the future.

Ripley noted that he had attended a Montessori kindergarten as a child and that he looked back fondly on the discovery method inherent in that form of education. This type of learning is one of the main opportunities for the Smithsonian. In this vein, he described the problems involved with demonstrating to professional educators that something (perhaps "education") does indeed happen to persons when they spend time in museums.

In further remarks concerning the Institution as a center for advanced study, Dr. Ripley mentioned several areas, such as marine biology and astrophysics, where the major work in the field is being done by scholars working at museums. Nevertheless, he felt that many of the best graduate students are actively discouraged by faculty advisors from working in museums because they lack "prestige." Dr. Ripley briefly described the Woodrow Wilson Scholars program at the Smithsonian; current projects include an investigation of the interrelationship between sociology and biology, and a study of the international law of the sea.

A small but developing program with which the Smithsonian is experimenting in Anacostia is the neighborhood museum concept, an attempt to make museum visits an everyday event, rather than a "culture pill."

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

At the present time the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum is the only extension of the Smithsonian in Washington; Dr. Ripley was very pleased with the carryover effect to the main Smithsonian buildings which seems to be occurring as a result of this experiment. Ripley thought that much could profitably be done to integrate classroom work with½ museum visits.

Another manner in which the Smithsonian is attempting to become a living part of the community is by sponsoring the performing arts. The Institution sponsors frequent performances on exhibit musical instruments, opens its facilities to dance companies, and sponsors film institutes.

During the question and answer period, Dr. Ripley was asked about the "schools without walls" concept. He replied that he had been quite used to this idea as a graduate student. At the elementary and secondary level, he said he would welcome the movement, although many procedural matters, such as transportation and feeding of students, remain to be conquered.

Dr. Ripley was asked if any attempts were made to phase children into museum visits, rather than treating these visits as an unrelated experience. He felt that many teachers did a good job of preparing students, but that more remained to be done in this area, both by the teachers and the Institution.

One questioner asked what the Smithsonian was doing to capitalize on the "Woodstock phenomenon. Ripley replied that the Institution had sponsored the folk festivals on the Mall for the past four years and that these had proved to be tremendously successful with all segments of the population.

--reported by Richard Hastings

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"EDUCATING FOR THE 21st CENTURY"

DR. RONALD E. BARNES
Director, Educational Planning for the Minnesota Experimental City
and Professor, Experimental Studies Program
Mankato State College, Minnesota

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Dr. Barnes spoke to us about the Minnesota Experimental City where he is responsible for planning of the educational system. It was this aspect of the city that he asked us to imagine with him.

We began by attempting to visualize this city of the future. Ron asked us all to close our eyes as we travelled with him toward the city. We left our cars behind and moved slowly on a kind of conveyor belt. We saw trees and a lake and finally we were all within the city.

But, as Ron pointed out, the city for each of us was different. For some of us participating in the dream trip, it was easy to imagine a kind of future city. For others, it was difficult. But such imaginings would seem to be important. Ron stressed the need to begin now to plan for our future; it just may be that cities as we mentally envision them will someday, someday soon, be the cities we are asked to live in. Our dreams are important.

Ron sees those people involved in future planning as dreamers. And as dreamers, they play on man's hopes, while the pessimists play on man's fears. It would seem that our hope in the future lies within the dreamers among us.

The idea of the Minnesota Experimental City was devised in the nineteen sixties. It arose out of a realization of the deterioration of urban living patterns. A group of people realized how badly this society (a society that will in five years be eighty percent urban) needs some examples of viable, living cities.

So in the late sixties, people began talking and planning for this city.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Fourteen workshops, each covering different aspects of the planning process, were held. Some limitations were then established. The city will be no more than a quarter of a million people, between forty five and fifty thousand acres, built within ten to fifteen years after it is begun (1973 or 1974), and a free standing, self sufficient community.

Phase two of the planning process has now begun. The first aspect of this is the economic studies which are not yet completed. The site for the city will be chosen by October 15, 1972. And the planning for the city will be chosen by October 15, 1972. And the planning for the educational system is underway; this system will be planned first because it appears to be the key to everything else.

To date, Ron and the other education planners have formulated some responses to traditional views of education. In brief, Ron included the following ideas:

To begin with, we envision an educational system where people never stop learning. Learning will no longer be confined to a specific place in the presence of a specific person. In fact, we imagine that full time teachers may become unnecessary. We will certainly do away with the assumption that one person is better than another because he knows more. Education as we foresee it should be an integral part of the community and the world. We envision the involvement of all parts of the society--the residents, the business and industrial sectors--in the education process. Finally, we hope for a system that will prepare self-reliant learners, learners who will actively participate in the design of their own educational programs. By changing the focus of education in these ways we will hopefully prepare people to deal with the future. We will be creating an educational system that will be able to adapt to change.

Ron went into some detail about specific characteristics of the education system of the Minnesota Experimental City. He included the following convictions:

1. Decisions in the learning system should remain in the hands of those affected by them.

2. Educational system will consist of a free network of resources, not isolated to any area, time, or function.

3. The eventual program will be experimental.

4. The system will be engaged in a continuous process of self renewal.

5. All people in the city will be considered learners and the education facilities will be available to everyone at all times.

6. All people will be considered resource people. Everyone has something he can contribute to the learning process. The use of technology--computer terminals, for example--is envisioned to facilitate the organization of this information.
    a) The idea of all people as resource people throughout their lifetime is particularly exciting when one considers the plight of the elderly in our world. In our city they would have a reason to go on living.

7. The educational system should be able to adapt to all demands; nobody should be rejected from it.

8. There must be accountability. The system should guarantee learners that the knowledge they desire will be learned.

9. If learning fails to take place, it is the fault of the system, not of the learner.

10. The system must always be ready to adapt to the learner's needs.

11. The educational system will be completely integrated into other systems. There will be no isolated 'school' structures, but rather centers of learning scattered throughout the community. The main street of the city will be the main corridor of the school.

12. The learning system will be a full-time system--twelve months a year, twenty-four hours a day.

13. Technological machines and devices will be used.

14. Whatever an individual chooses to do or to learn, the system should be able to make it available.

Ron concluded his statement be reemphasizing the need to plan, to make conscious decisions about our future. Without preparation for the future, he predicts failure. We must begin to build alternatives to meet the needs of a vastly different future. This struggle must be engaged in by young and old alike, together.

Following his presentation, there were numbers of questions. They basically illustrated Ron's comment about dreamers and pessimists. A few of the questions follow.

1. How will attendance records be kept? How will the demands of the traditional educational system be fulfilled?
2. How will a student attending school in the new town gain attendance to a traditional, certified university?
3. Society needs people who perform certain tasks; how will students of this city be prepared to perform traditional duties? Won't you be educating people to pursue their own interests to the neglect of the needs of society?
4. Will students raised in this free, open kind of society care about social issues? Won't their life have been so easy that they will fail to see genuine problems.
5. Who will live in the city? Won't all the same type of people be attracted to a new town, thus creating an undynamic, homogenous society?
6. How will the city be governed?
7. If there are no traditional school buildings, how will housing and neighborhood patterns be arranged?
8. Be creating this new city, aren't you writing off existing cities?
9. How will the city and its success be studied and monitored?
10. Isn't such intensive planning dehumanizing?

And so they went. The cynics, as one commenter pointed out, rather dominated the proceedings. But, as another participant noted, "I was especially impressed by Ron Barnes' presentation. His effort to move beyond the cognitive mode in which we are so accustomed to operate touches at what I see as a crucial issue. From discussion with other participants afterwards, it was clear that a lot of thinking is being done."

--reported by Sharon Enright
(attendance: 46 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"WHAT FUTURE FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES?"

Monday, April 17, 1972

Guest Speakers --

Dr. Otto F. Kraushaar, Director of "A Study of the American Independent School," and President Emeritus of Goucher College.

Dr. Edward D'Alessio, Director, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Catholic Conference.

Dr. Kraushaar opened the discussion by stressing that the private school world was changing so rapidly that a study of its position and future in society was thought necessary before impending forces, such as judicial decisions and financial pressures, altered the environment beyond recognition or control.

The Study, directed by Dr. Kraushaar, involved a general sample of 750 private schools, an indepth sample of 250, and personal visits to 60 schools. Both church-supported and privately financed schools were visited which satisfied public accreditation requirements.

The Study established the following taxonomy of private schools:

(1) management by those other than State agencies and not responsible directly to political entities.

---

* This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

(2) general absence of public financing.

(3) retention of a public function in the offering of an education meeting State requirements.

(4) providing a relationship of mutual trust between patron and school; one is not compelled to accept, the other is not compelled to attend; providing the patron with a psychological advantage in attending a school of choice and the school a sense of responsibility in accepting and teaching the child.

(5) autonomy of most private schools, although some church schools are part of a non-public system.

(6) private schools, for the most part, are smaller and more familial in nature and relationship; they present a more humanistic atmosphere; they lack a desire in general to expand beyond present size.

The above characteristics provide the structure and climate which attracts people to choose private schools in the belief that they will offer the following:

(1) religious and moral training and character development.

(2) diligent and disciplined work habits.

(3) a better education under a more individualized instruction.

Dr. D'Alessio stated that Catholic schools faced the best and worst of times.

In one sense the Catholic school system is confronted by a crisis. These schools reflect the problems of the Church - (1) declining contributions and attendance, (2) conflicting philosophies of the left and the right, and (3) an anti-establishment attitude.

Catholic schools similarly reflect problems of all schools today, public and private: (1) social change and controversy and (2) finances.

A crisis syndrome has hit the Catholic education today:

(1) enrollments are down

(2) costs are up

(3) schools are closing

(4) decline of religious teachers

On the other hand, there is a brighter side to the Catholic school issue:

(1) teacher-pupil ratio is declining

(2) new teaching methods and policy directives are being applied

(3) a moving out to the mainstream of society

(4) displaying a new attitude of maximizing the services of Church and community

(5) increase in the use of lay teachers

A more detailed examination of the crisis elements reveals that the major causes of financial distress are attributable to: (1) increased quality education, (2) increased teacher costs, and (3) inflation. Costs have risen at an annual rate of approximately 10 to 20 per cent . The lowering of the teacher/pupil ratio, coupled with the greatly increased percentage of lay teachers employed, has placed a particularly heavy burden upon costs. These costs, of course, are borne primarily by the parents themselves as little public financial assistance is available. Yet, many parents are unable to pay a tuition commensurate with total costs: 1 in 10 pay no tuition, 1 in 4 pay $50. $100 - $150 is the medium tuition payment, while average costs are $240 per pupil. Only approximately 15 per cent of the parents pay total pupil costs.

There has been a drop in Catholic school enrollment and in the number of schools in recent years, although the drop in the number of schools is due in large part to consolidation:

1967-68 = 13,000 elementary and secondary schools
1970-71 = 11,300 " " " "

1967-68 = 5.0 million enrollment
1970-71 = 4.4 " "

It is maintained, in partial justification for denial of assistance to parochial (or private) schools, that their enrollment could be accommodated without great burden in public schools.

On a uniform national average basis this might be so, but Catholic school enrollment is concentrated primarily in large urban areas where schools and school finances are already heavily burdened:

Percentage of Total School Enrollment in Catholic Schools:

Philadelphia = 34 per cent
Chicago = 32 " "
Gary = 32 " "
Pittsburgh = 29 " "
St. Louis = 29 " "
New York = 28 " "
Newark = 28 " "
Jersey City = 28 " "

Conflicting forces are presently at work regarding the financing of Catholic school education. On the negative side, Federal judicial decisions have given a broad interpretation to Constitutional provisions restricting public assistance to religious-oriented schools. On the positive side, the U.S. Office of Education conducted a conference in 1971 on private-public education to explore financing problems and solutions. The Commission on School Finance in its final report encouraged the expansion of aid to private schools in accordance with law. The upcoming report of the Panel on Nonpublic Education should provide additional suggestions and guidance concerning necessary support. The Council for American Private Education (C.A.P.E.)

has been organized, representing 95 per cent of non-public school population, to assist private schools to approach public agencies for assistance. Finally, several bills have been introduced in Congress to provide credits and assistance in behalf of private education.

Turning to the positive side of the Catholic school education system, it should be appreciated what benefits such a system provide society:

(1) offers a religious education

(2) provides parental choice

(3) affords competition and an alternative to public education

(4) makes innovation possible

(5) provides substantial financial savings to the public

In expressing support for the operation of nonpublic education such should not be considered an expression of opposition to public education. Both are needed. The one provides competition and a challenge of innovation to the other.

What may be looked upon as problems facing Catholic school education can also be seen as a sign of progress. For example, the decline in the number of schools has resulted to a significant extent from the consolidation of smaller schools into a fewer number of better quality schools. An increase in the number of lay teachers represents an assumption of a larger role in church-sponsored education by laymen and, as a result, in the broadening of the educational outlook and the introduction of fresh ideas.

The decline in enrollment, the increase in the number of lay teachers, and the consolidation of schools has also had the effect of reducing overcrowding and in lowering the student/teacher ratio. In 1971 such ratio for elementary schools was 1/28; for secondary schools, 1/19.

The quality of teachers has also risen so that the following percentages of teachers are certificated at present:

Elementary Schools

Religious Teachers = 63½%

Lay " = 52 %

Secondary Schools

Religious Teachers = 65 %

Lay " = 62 %

As for response to minority groups, enrollment in Catholic schools is not high, as a percentage of total population, but it exceeds significantly the percentage of minority members who are members of the Church.

Increasingly, the Church sees its educational activities as an integrated function of the overall Church mission. It is also recognized that Catholic education is a responsibility of the entire Church community. Diocesan school boards, composed of lay and religious members, are gaining increasing responsibility over the operations of the schools rather than having primary responsibility rest with religious leaders alone.

The Catholic school system is also engaged in increased research, educational television programming, individualized instruction, and other forms of educational experimentation.

In conclusion, American education should be regarded as an integrated whole. The continued treatment of public and private education as isolated segments can no longer be permitted. There are different ways to be a citizen. American education should and can reflect these differences without damaging society.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. to Dr. Kraushaar -- In regard to your comment that private schools provide a special relationship between the child, the parent, and the school, does such a relationship apply also to parochial schools?

A. -- Yes, today. In the past, the Catholic school system did not provide such a choice. A goal was laid down of a school in every parish, but this was never realized. Today, it is even less true and Catholic parents clearly have a choice. Furthermore, parental involvement in Catholic education is far greater today than in the past and is being even more encouraged. Lay boards of trustees in Catholic schools are increasing.

There is in nonpublic schools a community of interest. Parents become more deeply involved. As a rule, the psychological element is lacking in a client relationship in public schools, although some parental involvement certainly exists.

It would be a great loss to the United States for private schools to decline or disappear. At the present time public schools bear the brunt of providing education in this country. Such is not so in many countries, however, such as Holland and Australia, where there is wide support for public financing of private education.

Q. to Dr. Kraushaar and Dr. D'Alessio -- The New York Fleischmann Commission found many cases of decline in nonpublic schools which could not have been alleviated by financial help. What is required beside such assistance to stem the decline?

A. of Dr. Kraushaar -- Much of the growth of nonpublic education occurred in the 1940's and 1950's. Since then certain key factors have occurred to alter the picture. A primary cause has been the major shift of population to the suburbs where public schools offer a better education.

Over the years a pattern can be traced of a rise and decline of independent schools. This will continue. In present times the single most important cause of the decline is traceable to finances. The recent court decisions must be looked upon as further weakening the stability of nonpublic education by prohibiting public financial support. In the study conducted under my direction, the following nonpublic school indebtedness was found:

one-third = little

one-third = up to $100,000

one-third = over $100,000

Most private schools are small. For one-third to have an indebtedness of over $100,000 spells serious difficulty. Many may parish.

A. by Dr. D'Alessio -- The cause of decline is attributable primarily to finances, a shift of population to the suburbs, and consolidation.

Parents today are themselves facing an increased financial squeeze. They are increasingly looking toward the rising costs of college education and are being forced to make a pragmatic choice as to which to afford.

Q. to Dr. Kraushaar -- The President's Commission on School Finances found that nonpublic school enrollments will decline as much as one-half between now and 1980. Yet, this decline cannot be primarily attributed to financial conditions. What are the main causes?

A. -- To reiterate, the study conducted under my direction showed general parental satisfaction with private education, but the existence of crucial cost problems. In spite of the many closings, new schools continue to spring up. How can this be explained other than by a demand by parents for such type of education? A lack of finances spells the reason for school closings far more than parental dissatisfaction.

Q. to Dr. D'Alessio -- Isn't the Catholic Church one of the most ill-suited vehicles for innovation and renewal either in education or in other areas of society? The size and power of the Church makes it status quo oriented. Have not parochial schools become havens for people who want to flee urban problems? Is not the Church basically wealthy, although permitting its educational sector to fall into financial straights? Can C.A.P.E. be considered evidence of renewal? What is the capacity of parochial schools for renewal?

A. -- The Church, despite all its human imperfections, is one of the few institutions left which is capable of coping with the problems of society, with renewal and with change. Some of the most progressive thinking in the country is taking place within its provinces. This thinking is increasingly being reflected in the Catholic schools.

Catholic schools in the ghettos are not a haven for those seeking to flee urban ills. A far greater proportion of Blacks are offered education - generally under subsidized arrangement - in such schools than are represented in their two per cent proportionate membership in the Church. Contrary to providing a haven, parochial schools help maintain an integrated setting. And, most important of all, they provide parents with the opportunity to obtain a quality education for their children in urban areas.

(Dr. Kraushaar added to the above response the thought that one should question whether the State is the best vehicle and should have the primary responsibility for educating children. In hospital and medical care, in the arts, and in many other areas, a good partnership exists between the State and the private sector, with the private sector taking charge. Why not the same for education.

Q. to Dr. Kraushaar -- While nonpublic schools may be performing a public function, do they not discriminate in race, sex and income-status?

A. -- This does present a fundamental dilemma. But, similar problems occur in public education also. For example, families leave urban areas to flee racial and lower-income pressures. This is a choice people seek to exercise. People tend to associate with their own kind for cultural, ethnic, religious and other reasons.

But, many private schools recognize an obligation to produce a better student mix. Increasingly, sums are being raised to recruit lower-income students to provide heterogenity. In Catholic schools in the District of Columbia, for example, approximately 29 per cent of the students are Black, while only 12 percent of Catholic membership is Black.

Q. to Dr. Krausnaar -- Do you favor Federal funds being contributed to free schools?

A. -- That would be a worthwhile investment although one must recognize that such would have to run the gamut of public criticism concerning the use of taxpayers' money.

Free schools can tell us something about the processes of education. We should all do what we can to encourage new schools.

--Reported by William Copenhaver
(attendance: 38 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

"Educational Policy Research at the Harvard Graudate School of Education"
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Friday, April 28, 1972

NOTES OF A PARTICIPANT*

The participants in the ESS field trip to Harvard heard four speakers who were members of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. They were: Shepard White, Mike Smith, William Greenbaum, and David Cohen.

Shepard White

Family stress is the most important factor among disadvantaged, pre-school children, according to Shepard White. In reducing this element, income and housing programs are essential. These are as relevant as pre-school programs.

A definition for "disadvantaged" children cannot be derived singly, although it is generally thought of as "the poor, black, urban child." Regionalism must also be taken into account.

The biggest issue in a definition of disadvantaged children is that a variety of factors must be considered, including ethnic, income, regionals, crisis (born with a disease or handicapped or missing one or both parents), and equity (not getting a fair share of government resources).

White believed "a disadvantaged child" could be defined by determining the public purposes towards child development. He felt there are four purposes: the development of vocational competence on the part of the child (in this area, public dollars are used to express public interest); creation of a political and social community (previously, the attitude has been to take a newcomer and teach them to be similar to those who are around him); labor regulations (rising educational level correlates with the decline in the labor market); risk insurance on a compassionate basis (will support programs which help children).

White commented that the schools were over-investing in the reading programs. Too much time is being spent on this subject. Educational reform is needed to close the gaps, but White felt that the efforts for reform were reaching a dead-end. A college education is not necessary for every member of society and the schools should begin to de-emphasize their importance. Development of other abilities should be encouraged through career education programs. Children should not learn solely verbal and math skills and they should not be on a track system. Rather, the current college-prep route in the schools should be revised to a development of the child's social, manipulative, and visual skills.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

196

White further noted that "readiness to read" means learning to read in a way and at a time that society deems appropriate. There is no reason for a child to learn to read at age four. He stressed the importance of working with the family as opposed to going around it.

Mike Smith (Assistant Professor of Education and Director of the Evaluation Study of the planned variation program of Head Start)

Mike Smith discussed the study which was a review of scientific and program evidence pertaining to the "reasonableness and effectiveness of present Federal programs for disadvantaged children". Policy recommendations have been set as the primary goal of this study. Smith, being involved with the Center for Educational Policy Research, spoke as to the effects of schools.

He maintained that differences among schools have little effect at the elementary and secondary level. After reviewing many reports and programs dealing with compensatory education (including the Coleman Report, American Institutional Research program, and Talent), they found little positive evidence to show that inputs during the past five years have a correlation to achievement.

Three studies were reviewed during Smith's presentation: The Teacher Effect Study, The Summer Effect Study, and The Planned Variation Study.

The Teacher Effect Study attempted to determine differences among teachers by posing the question: are there differences among teachers which will hold up over a number of years? This was an attempt to correlate teacher attributes with effectiveness. Smith felt there was a need for more research in this area, as positive conclusions could not be reached.

The Summer Effect Study compared growth rates between children from low-income families and children from median-income families. From October to May the growth rate between children was the same; while between May and September, the middle-income children had a growth rate of one-half of the rate during the school year. During this latter time frame, low-income children had no growth rate.

The Planned Variation Study compares different study outcomes of various programs. The problem with this study was that the Office of Child Development allowed the local area to select the classroom models, whereas random assignments of models and cities were needed. As it was, much of the value of the study was destroyed.

Smith felt that they were not yet in a position to make recommendations or even come to definite conclusions on their study.

William Greenbaum (Teaching Fellow in Education at Harvard Graduate School of Education; was a principal researcher in a study of the National Assessment Project)

The National Assessment Project attempted to determine achievements by the schools and to encourage states to set up a similar format to provide state-wide and nation-wide correlation. Greenbaum posed the question: what are the political conditions necessary for change in education? More information means more change which means going to the taxpayer for more dollars. He felt information could not be gathered to make invidious assessments for the purposes of change. Children do not have the political clout to make organized change. Educational people must become involved in the political process in order to have their proposals accepted.

It is difficult to discuss a valid national assessment of education **without first having** the states assess their own system. Greenbaum was concerned because, rather than looking at the full spectrum of the youth of our country to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses, there is a tendency to be concerned with only the top ten percent and to ignore the other ninety percent. He questioned whether we could come to a specific objective. Should we ask "what roles do the schools play" or "what role should the school play"? Questions regarding such concerns as career education should be asked of the citizens .

During the past five years, three states that have attempted to develop assessment commissions have spent their time working on **the design of their own bureaucracies.** The National Assessment Project probably couldn't get the states to develop similar assessment practices on a national basis.

Federal dollars should be given to the states to develop assessment departments, however. In order to strengthen them, the states should build organizations and then within fifteen to twenty years the Federal government could pull together a national picture.

David Cohen (Professor of Education and Social Policy; Director of Center for Educational Policy Research)

Cohen, as is Mike Smith, is involved in the analysis of Federal policy and programs for disadvantaged children. He stated that there was no regular relationship between the productivity of schools and their teachers. The study of the impact of policies on achievement must take into account individual aspiration and the number of years spent in school.

Schools are not factories. And hence, there is no one underlying factor for productivity or the lack of it.

There appears to be no relationship between test scores and later occupational status. The difference in educational attainment can be used to predict the length one will stay in school. Employers do tend to use the number of school years for hiring. It was pointed out, however, that the number of years correlate with various "degrees".

Again it was stressed that there was no correlation between test scores and occupational level, provided there is an equal educational level. Differences in occupational status also has to do with motivation and personal habits. Generally, the underlying importance of test scores is either incorrect or greatly exaggerated.

Actually, how long a person stays in school goes beyond test scores to include factors such as income, family, aspiration, personal motivation. We tend to treat schools like factories in that we try to find a relationship between input and output.

Alternatives to schools being thought of as such factories are that they are "a generalized climate" (make the schools equal) or "certification systems" (I.Q. can predict how far an individual will go in school to a very limited extent).

--reported by Cynthia Banzer
(31 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING: IS IT REALLY DEAD?"

Dr. George R. Hall, Senior Economist, Management Sciences Department,
The Rand Corporation
Charles Stalford, Project Manager, Performance Contracting Experiment,
Office of Economic Opportunity

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. Stalford noted that performance contracting seemed to be "sweeping the country" in the spring of 1970 when OEO decided to test it through a structured field experiment. The project involved 25,000 children at 20 sites across the country, who were pre- and post-tested at the same time to allow reporting of results on a comparable basis across sites. There were 212 "combinations" or pairs of matched experimental and control groups in the projects. The results of the standardized, nationally-normed tests used showed:

--in 28 combinations, the experimental group made greater gains than the control group
--in 124 combinations, there was no significant difference in gains
--in 60 combinations, the control group made greater gains than the experimental group

Further analysis of the data showed that all combinations did poorly, despite their gains. The "name of the game" was to bring children up to grade level in achievement, because people attach an economic value to grade-level scores. This did not happen. Although little attention was given to effective measures, OEO did find that no overall improvement in attendance took place. Nor was performance contracting a low-cost way to experiment, because staffing costs--even with frequent use of paraprofessionals--were as high or higher than costs of regular programs.

Why didn't performance contracting work? Stalford offered several possible explanations:

1 - The companies "just didn't have it."
2 - The techniques for bringing about consistent, significant gains don't exist at all.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

3 - The short preparation time for the experiment
4 - The novelty of large-scale experimentation in schools and the pressure on schools that resulted from publicity and controversy concerning the experiment
5 - Problems with testing and measurement. The time and expense of managing a performance contract, disputes over contract resolution, children's absences and other interruptions to the contractors' programs, the "sheer, day-to-day problems", are all factors working against a future for performance contracting.

Mr. Hall found three widespread expectations in the performance contracting movement:

1 - It would bring improvement in the achievement results of compensatory education.
2 - It would give new impetus to the movement for accountability.
3 - It would speed up the introduction of new technology into a system traditionally resistant to innovation. But the achievement gains at the sites monitored by Rand, although "respectable," were generally disappointing in terms of the claims of the contractor and the expectations of the districts. "Performance contracting is not the way to play catch-up ball."

As regards accountability, the use of standardized tests raises the issue of whether the material that is tested matches up with the material that needs to be taught to the children. This is often not the case. The Texarkana and Norfolk sites monitored by Rand (reported in Case Studies in Educational Performance Contracting), as well as all the OEO sites, tried to use criterion-referenced tests to determine whether specific learning objectives had been met. But such tests are not yet standardized; they present serious problems of development, logistics, and sampling. "We don't yet have the test and measurement instruments that we need," said Hall.

Rand gave performance contracting high marks as a change agent. Contractors had a much greater degree of flexibility for introducing new technology, new staffing patterns, new roles for teachers and students, into their programs. Success as a technique for research and development has resulted in the interest and effort of many teachers at former performance contracting sites to continue the techniques, materials and activities introduced by the contractor.

Hall finds that there often were cost advantages to performance contracting. The programs did cost more than regular programs, which was to be expected given their intensive, remedial nature. But they cost no more, and often less, than typical remedial programs. Given the high "start-up" costs of performance contracts and the inevitable "developmental" phase they go through during the first months of operation, there is a basis for possible improvements in cost-effectiveness on a long-term basis.

Q - Even though performance contracting has not been particularly successful with disadvantaged kids, could it work with average kids?

A - Programs so far have emphasized basic skills for the disadvantaged. Performance contracting has never been tested as a speed-up process for average youngsters. The OEO programs were a disappointment, however, to parents who had hoped that their children would progress faster with an upgraded curriculum.

Q - In what areas other than reading and math skills might performance contracting be tried?

A - Vocational education programs are a likely area. Performance norms for many occupational skills have been well defined by now and would readily lend themselves to a contract which ties payment to specific skills acquisition by the student.

Q - Was a one-year test adequate to evaluate the full potential of performance contracting for helping children?

A - There were problems of start-up time, controversy, operating conditions in the schools, and readiness of contractors to implement their programs, which have already been discussed. Perhaps a five-year experiment would have shown better results; but you don't need a performance contract to get results over a five-year period. Despite all its shortcomings, the OEO experiment did give performance contracting a chance to prove itself. Now, OEO has not rejected performance contracting; all we are saying is that what we tried out didn't help the kids.

Another problem to consider, besides the time-span of the experiment, is why school districts wanted to participate in it. They liked the Federal money, the publicity, the chance to say that they are innovative. But, typically, they had little capacity to define the learning objectives of the school system and to measure progress towards achieving those objectives. The project was often of little importance to the district and lacked a high-level sponsor who could "make it go." Interestingly, results were sometimes better in the smaller, rural districts where the project was seen as important and had an influential sponsor.

Q - In the OEO experiment, was there any "cluster analysis" of combinations where experimental students did better than control students? Was there any analysis of program components, such as teacher training, which might have influenced the results? Was there consideration of the developmental nature of the project?

A - We did very little of this. The emphasis was on cognitive gains and, no matter how we looked at them, the results showed that performance contracting had not lived up to its promises.

Q - Will performance contracting continue?

A - On a limited scale and for such purposes as research and development, technological innovation, and vocational skills as well as basic skills in reading and math. One long-term factor that could help would be the development of standardized criterion-referenced tests to measure accurately, on a pre- and post-basis, whether a student has mastered a particular skill. Another likelihood is "internal" contracting, in which the district contracts with teachers or the teachers' association for specific achievement gains.

Q - Will there be any further evaluation of performance contracting?

A - Most contracts do have provisions for evaluation built in. The Office of Education has also contracted with Rand for a follow-on evaluation at the same five sites monitored in 1970-71; the results of this study should be available next fall.

--reported by Edward Glassman
(attendance: 26 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* VISIT TO EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.

Friday June 16, 1972

This ESS visit was designed to acquaint participants with the wide variety of activities conducted at Educational Testing Service, and to discuss possible future directions in educational research and development.

After arriving on the Metroliner, the meeting began at 10:00 A.M. with an overview presented by William W. Turnbull, President of ETS. We were informed that the budget of the organization is currently $46 million annually, and that it has doubled every 5 years since ETS was formed in 1948. Eighty percent of this budget is devoted to conducting testing programs to improve educational research and development, which was defined as assisting in the development of a science of human behavior.

Samuel J. Messick described the research functions at ETS, and noted that they were divided into 3 main areas:

1. Psychological studies which include basic research on the learner in relation to his environment.
2. Developmental research which attempts to understand and solve the major problems in education from pre-school through higher education as they relate to the individual student.
3. Educational studies which deal with educational programs, systems, and objectives.

These research areas are supported by an Office of Data Analysis Research, as well as other ETS supporting services, and complemented by research in regional offices.

In a discussion following these presentations, the following responses were elicited:

1. Care is now being taken to ensure that racially biased or loaded questions are removed from test materials.
2. Attempts are being made to ensure that individual student needs are met in testing, as opposed to primarily meeting the needs of higher education or the professions.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

3. Although more attention is being paid to student needs, there is nothing inherently wrong with devising culturally oriented tests for graduate and professional school needs, since some schools will still want such tests so that they can select and educate certain types of students.

4. Attempts are now being made to reduce the "seduction of numbers" involved in quantifying student abilities by evaluating long-term student work.

As the discussion turned to criterion-referenced tests, which attempt to measure test-takers against a fixed achievement level, the point was made that criterion referenced tests are not greatly different from traditional norm-referenced tests, which measure students against each other, since to develop the criterion, some achievement level must be set, which almost always leads back to student norms.

Since the afternoon was to be devoted to 6 discussion groups, the remainder of the morning was spent on brief outlines of the topics to be covered in the afternoon groups so that the participants could select a group closest to their interests.

Edward A. Chittenden discussed open education and ETS' role in evaluating new efforts to change classroom practices.

Paul Campbell informed the group that ETS is involved in the National Assessment Program through contract, and assists in state-wide testing and assessment programs.

A more detailed presentation on Teacher Assessment was made by Frederick McDonald who said that research groups were attempting to measure teacher performance, as well as measure the relationship between performance and some kind of learning. He noted that other areas of concern in teacher assessment were developing competency-based evaluation models, accountability systems, and evaluations of the relationship between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness.

John Valley discussed the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, which ETS is sponsoring, and which is studying the possibilities for non-traditional higher education programs in America, including credit by examination, advanced placement, as well as the use of technology to increase educational opportunities.

Robert Solomon touched briefly on the traditional testing programs conducted under ETS auspices, and informed the group that ETS was also developing professional, career, and vocational tests in such areas as foreign service, police work, architecture, auto repair, and medical technology. ETS. said Solomon, maintains strict confidentiality on test results -- some of which date back to 1900 -- releasing them only on the request of the students.

Samuel Messick noted that the area of personality research might have even more touchy implications as far as confidentiality is concerned, and said that personality research dealt with both cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of learning. Cognitive styles he defined as a characteristic way of approaching a problem. By way of example he contrasted articulated and global cognitive approaches to problems. The articulated style was described as an analytic method of separating a problem from surrounding issues, and examining it alone. The global approach involves looking at the total picture, and an individual who characteristically approaches problems in this fashion can be incapable of focusing on one specific area.

The discussion following these presentations centered mainly on the National Institute of Education, created in the Education Amendments of 1972, and its role in the future of educational research and development.

At lunch additional members of the ETS staff joined the participants, and discussed their special areas of interest. At the recorder's table a staff member discussed the value of the Parents' Confidential Statement (PCS) used by the College Scholarship Service (CSS) as a needs analysis tool for student financial aid. He observed that his experience indicated that CSS claims as to the validity of the PCS were somewhat overstated.

After lunch, a tour of the impressive facilities at ETS was arranged. Most participants appeared particularly interested in three features:

1. The massive room in which test results such as the SAT were received, collated, scored, and mailed to colleges and students.

2. CIGE, an interactive computer installation for assisting high school students with academic guidance.

3. A small laboratory for the study of the development of small children.

This recorder attended the session directed by Samuel J. Messick on personality research. The group began with a general discussion of the role of NIE, which Mr. Messick hoped would set policy but avoid the trap of trying to outline every step needed to implement that policy. He also stated that he hoped the Institute would be open to suggestions from researchers in the field, and that it might consider adopting the functional grouping which characterized the research at ETS so as to allow cross-fertilization between project groups.

When the conversation turned to the ethical considerations of personality testing, Mr. Messick expressed the opinion that recommendations similar to those put forth by the Russell Sage Foundation should be in force to protect the confidentiality of all test results. These recommendations included the right of the parent, and students when old enough, to authorize the use of the information in their files, and provisions to purge the files.

As to the value of measuring personality characteristics, Mr. Messick explained that the only legitimate reason was the hope that if the personality correlates of various cognitive styles could be understood, we might be able to better design the learning experience for all students.

Creativity, said Mr. Messick, is one of the most intriguing problems in personality research, and although we do not understand what makes a person creative, we do know that the following are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for its existence:

1. The possession of divergent thinking, that is, the ability to generate a lot of different, and complicated, ideas from one object or group of objects;
2. Unusual perception;
3. Appropriate ideas, that is, ideas that are not absurd or bizarre;
4. An ability, not yet defined, to transform an idea into a worthwhile new product, so that a new and generally accepted view will evolve;
5. Condensation, that is, the ability to state a complicated creative idea concisely.

A brief wrap-up session turned on the use of research in developing policy. The view was expressed that a great deal of research has been done, and that some means of transmitting the results to policy-makers for action must be devised. An objection was raised, however, that much of the results of educational research and development work is contradictory, and even valueless, and that before rushing to change policies on the basis of available research, better research was needed.

--reported by Jim Harvey
(attendance: 23 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

Princeton, New Jersey
Friday, December 8, 1972

Testing and related activities constitute the most widely known of ETS activities. The Pre-Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT),Scholastic Aptitute Test (SAT), Graduate Record Examination (GRE), and possibly the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), or National Teacher Examinations (NTE) constitute a well-known litany among the post-World graduate and graduate students. However, as William W. Turnbull, President of ETS, and other ETS staff members explained to us, testing is but one of the major activities of ETS. In addition, ETS is engaged in broad educational research and instructional activities.

The format for the day's program consisted of presentations of various ETS activities by individuals and panels from the ETS staff. Questions from the group were invited during and at the conclusion of each presentation. Luncheon was taken at small tables organized topically and manned by at least one ETS staff member.

ETS activities are governed and advised through a committee system. The overall policy of the organization is set by a board of trustees composed primarily of higher education administrators. There are advisory committees on Tests and Measurements, on Research, and on Finance which review activities in their respective areas. In addition, there are policy committees for the various testing programs and test development committees that assist ETS staff in developing achievement tests.

ETS was founded in 1947 by three national organizations: the American Council on Education, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. These organizations were all administering tests at the time and sought to consolidate services and eliminate duplication. As noted earlier, the organization has grown rapidly in the volume and range of its activities.

Testing is still a major and growing function of ETS. The testing programs aid in the selection of candidates for undergraduate, graduate and professional institutions and measure the academic promise and performance of students for placement, guidance, and evaluation purposes. These are the tests, from the PSAT through LSAT, which are familiar to all who participate in higher education.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

ETS is now branching out into a new area of testing - professional and occupational certification and evaluation. Recently, 15,000 people took the first administration of the test for auto mechanic certification. ETS was asked to develop the test by a National Association of Automobile Dealers as a move to institute some quality control in the auto services industry.

The project director was questioned about the potential of using a written test (such as that developed for the mechanics) for occupations requiring relatively few writing skills. The director responded that they tried to use simple and direct language, pictures, diagrams and had provided a generous time limit for the test. Interpreters and tape recorders could also be used in special circumstances. He indicated an awareness of the value of a "hands-on" test but the development of a practical way to administer such a test seems far in the future.

ETS is also working on the development of a national examination for real estate agents and brokers and a self-education and assessment test in dentistry. In the latter instance, a dentist would take the self-administered four-part test, and mail the answers to ETS. The return results would give the dentist an idea of those areas of his field where his knowledge may be deficient or outdated.

In response to minority group criticism of cultural bias in aptitude and achievement testing, ETS had been examining its tests to find out how they can be more fairly constructed. Thus far, ETS has found that its tests are not biased against minority groups and women in terms of the purposes of the aptitude tests. The tests are predictors of success in the freshman year of college and, as such, are accurate. Further efforts are underway to measure the achievements of minority group persons, but the value of such tests as predictors of success will hinge on adjustments by institutions of higher education to a new type of student.

Research at ETS can be broken down into three general catagories: 1)Psychological research, 2)educational applications, and 3) theories, methods, and systems research.

The psychological research effort encompasses the areas of human development, learning and cognition, personality and social behavior. Applied educational research is concerned with early and primary education, cultural diversity, and the disadvantaged, career and vocation, and evaluation of educational systems. The theories, methods, and systems research catagory covers psychometric theory, methodological research, and computer studies.

Summaries of specific projects such as Nontraditional Studies and Teacher Performance were presented to the group. The Nontraditional Studies programs assists development of new degree programs. In large measure the project acts as an information clearinghouse concerning new activities which will increase degree options.

The efforts in Teacher Performance are directed toward measurable performance standards, rather than a given number of course units, for certification of teachers. The states of New York and California are already moving in this direction and other states are expected to follow suit.

A concern raised on several occasions by members of the group was the effectiveness of dissemination. The ETS dissemination efforts, as described briefly to the group, are reasonably conventional, consisting primarily of mass mailings and publications. The only suggestion provided for improving the dissemination efforts of other organizations was to "enrich" the existing methods of dissemination.

As the final question of the day, President Turnbull was asked how he would spend the funds appropriated for the National Institute of Education. Turnbull answered that NIE should concentrate on identifying educational products that work and finding out why they work.

---reported by Dave Groton
(25 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY   INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKERS ARE UNPREPARED FOR TOMORROW: DISCONTINUITIES IN THE ISSUES OF THE '70's"

Charles Williams
Deputy Director, Center for the Study of Social Policy
Stanford Research Institute

Thursday, June 29, 1972

Williams prefaced his remarks by stating that his presentation was a verbal report of analysis currently underway and that the systematic interrelationship of the concepts to be discussed should be more fully explored.

The planning documents of the '60s did not reflect the major issues which confronted educational policy makers in that decade. For example, in 1963-65 the major thrust at NSF was still graduate education and manpower development, despite the fact that policy research staff were pointing out that this was not a wise course to follow. An even more recent example of the lack of long range planning is that, as late as 1970, the Office of Education's forward plan did not address itself to the burning issues of the early '70s, busing and school finance reform. Williams asserted that, in actual operation the policy-making/planning process is the budget process extended. In most federal agencies, budget plans drawn out over three to five years are accepted as long range plans.

Williams identified two kinds of incrementalism: the first, dominant operationally, assumes an extrapolated kind of trajectory and suggests no basic adjustments in the system are necessary. The second seeks to bring about fundamental redirection in the system. Policy makers are most often caught by surprise because their anticipatory policy analysis is inadequate for the conditions under which their policies are actually executed.

Two conditions will be operative in educational policy for the rest of this decade: society will remain in a state of dynamic change and the trajectory which present educational policy promotes may not be accepted by policy-makers as valuable or even tolerable. Williams believes that the operational characteristics and assumptions of present educational policy will not continue to be viable in the unfolding political context. Trend-breaking issues will continue to confront educational policy makers. Williams suggests that in dealing with reforms to finance our educational system we may have to acknowledge that the basic assumptions underlying compensatory education are wrong.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The specific conditions upon which Mr. Williams based his comments are that the '70s will be a period of disjuncts in educational policy and that adaptation to them will be more difficult than it was in the '60s. The reasons for this include:

(1) the priority battle for funds in the federal domestic budget will be heightened

(2) the value of education in the political context will be lessened (the 'motherhood' mystique is eroding)

(3) the priority battle re: alternatives in the domestic program will involve tradeoffs between such systems as education and health care or between education and transportation .

The major developments in educational policy issues Williams outlined for the '70s are:

(1) The pattern of political dynamics within the educational establishment will continue--unionization is gaining momentum and collective bargaining is a fact. This, plus cost-push inflationary tendencies now built systemically into the system, will contribute to a lessening of public sympathy for the "unpaid teacher".

(2) The conflict between professionals and paraprofessionals will create the equivalent of featherbedding and make innovation difficult. Williams feels that teachers in oversupply will try to create a demand for themselves (not unlike railroad fireman did years ago).

(3 The rationale for continued growth of the system, i.e. buildings, teachers, etc., will persist among educators even while the number of students levels off.

(4) Compensatory education will deal with a proportionately larger percentage of the school population than ever before.

(5) As urban trends emerge, there will be a fading of racial class ambiguity in the declining central cities. We will find that major urban problems are not racial but class

problems, which are more difficult to deal with on political terms.

(6) Revenue sharing could well be the way to stabilize continued growth of the educational system. But, if 40% of the educational process is supported by the Federal government, the finance of the educational system will be much more vulnerable than if it were maintained on a more diversified base. Should equalization of expenditures become a reality, national private educational corporations will become much more feasible. Williams believes that once the public, particularly the middle class, feels the opportunity to purchase differential quality education is no longer present within the public system, they will turn elsewhere.

(7) The migration of the better-off,plus pressures for national growth policies, will keep the demand for capital investment in school systems high. This is likely to mean that decisions on alternatives will be taken out of the hands of the professionals.

(8) If evaluative research continues at its present program level, it may erode the rationale for compensatory education and the expenditures per se. Should this occur, Williams asserted that the now-growing feeling that the general educational system is failing will be enhanced.

(9) The control of objectives in terms of Federal monitorship can be expected to shift from pre-program to post-audit concept and this implies a major shift in accountability.

(10) Behavioral control technologies will probably mature to the point where they will invalidate current assumptions and will begin to pose new issues, some of which are likely to be constitutional in nature.

In the question and answer session which followed, Williams said that the trends he foresaw will be in line between now and 1976 or 1980 at the outset. He admonished those present not to get "uptight" about them; rather he urged them to take a posture of contingency. Some things can be done to preclude their harshest impact. Careful planning of alternative courses of action should proceed in "low key" in the event that a catalytic event does occur which will cause a frantic search for viable alternativies.

When asked about the difficulty of distinguishing between predictions of issues and results, Williams responded that he makes no predictions--just probability statements. He admits that his judgement has not always been wholly scientific and that his line of analysis is untested. Corporate memory structures must be developed and the reactive mind set of responsible program people overcome. Williams is not pessimistic; he thinks the educational system will survive the '70's but with considerable struggle.

With reference to the funding battle, education has not yet dealt with America's silent majority. If education loses its esteemed place in public opinion, its constituency will change and likewise its financial situation.

Williams feels retrenchment in all areas of public expenditure is likely when our rate of public expenditure is paced out against the growth of the GNP. We can no longer use the defense budget as a planning guideline. Nationalism is a fact of life in the contemporary world and, accordingly, we cannot anticipate much further decline in the defense budget in our working lifetime.

When asked if planning can, in fact, bring about a worse universe than just muddling through, Williams replied that it was indeed possible but that reactive action carries an increased probability of strategic error.

The wrap-up question addressed to Williams was what can be done to prepare educational policy-makers? He stated that there are training programs designed to facilitate planning capability and that gaming, simulation, and group communication techniques are helpful experiences. He knows of no federal agency which is systematically approaching the problem along these lines. It does not require a massive effort. Williams believes that if one out of every fifty policy-makers could acquire some of this training and adopt all anticipatory policy psychology, the benefit to the nation's educational system would be substantial. For the remainder of those people dealing with educational policy, Williams suggested the best they can do is continue to handle problems on a day-to-day basis reserving perhaps 10% of their effort for forward planning activities aggregated in institutions outside government designed for that purpose as their primary role and function.

-- reported by Judy Pitney
(Attendance: 39 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"EDUCATIONAL VOUCHERS: THE OEO PROGRAM IN 1972 AND BEYOND"

Friday, August 18, 1972

Much of the discussion on educational finance and quality education in the last two years has centered on educational vouchers. The basis of the voucher system is a process to involve parents and students in creation and continuation of new programs coupled with a financial system to make it work. The basic assumption in the voucher system is that the educational system as presently constituted does not serve all the needs of its diverse clientele. The educational voucher was first proposed by Milton Friedman several years ago. His contention was that schools were funded without regard to their success and that this might be changed if a consumer mechanism were introduced into school funding. The Friedman model was an unregulated voucher model. As the idea became refined later, models included additional conderations for integration and possible limitations of the vouchers'use in private schools. A form of vouchers has been tried in five southern states. They were all held unconstitutional, as being experiments that re-segregate. Most early models of vouchers include all types of schools, public and private. In later models of vouchers three concerns were focused on: First, what kind of supplementation is necessary to ensure that equal access to all schools will be possible and that compensatory provisions might be included for educationally disadvantaged students. Second, how can a voucher system limit other types of discrimination, using a modified open admissions system or a lottery system? Third, how does a voucher system insure that adequate disclosures about the operation of the schools are made to the community so that wise consumer choices can be made?

The problems of establishing a voucher authority are similar to those experienced in other overall systemic alterations. First, and foremost, agreement must be reached with all those interested in the system, including the superintendent, school board, city officials, leaders in the community and on the state and national level, teachers, parents, and students. Second, is concern for handling the problems of race, religion and parochial participation. Third, how do you change regulations so that diversity can be accomplished? The most immediate problem in starting a voucher system is getting a consensus on goals for the educational system. The voucher system, more than a traditional system, may meet the needs of those desiring differing educational philosophies. The voucher system changes the balance of power in school systems to respond more to the requirements of their clients. Their operating philosophy may well be "change it or lose it." Hopefully, the operating model will produce a more fertile group for innovation. In the fuller model, the program is open-ended enough so that parents can, in fact, set up schools of their own. The Educational Voucher Authority may retain centralized purchasing ability and may assist in start up costs, but the rest of decision focus is held within the particular school unit. The EVA does not have the right to approve or disapprove of a school continuation. This is, in fact, one of the many paradoxes of the full model. An EVA cannot refuse the start up of a new school though they work on a limited funds basis. At some point funding decisions may be made on the basis of publicly raised funds which are not, after all, totally elastic. The EVA also acts to help distribute information about the different types of learning opportunities and makes sure that it is clear that the type of educational system envisaged by each school is carried out. Obviously, opinion makers in the community also come into play in the process of information dissemination.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The Office of Economic Opportunity's basic hypothesis was that poor parents have not been able to choose what they consider good education. OEO made a nation-wide canvas of school districts, to learn the issues facing the schools and to learn levels of satisfaction in particular districts. Alum Rock*as well as San Francisco, Gary and Seattle considered going into the experiment. However, because of local problems, especially busing problems in San Francisco and Seattle, Alum Rock was the only unit to continue with the discussions.

One question was raised about the open enrollment studies in the Detroit school system which showed that those who chose open enrollments were white students searching for better white schools and good students in black schools searching for better white schools. As a result of this out-migration, conditions for poor students in poor schools became even worse. The EVA will hopefully be able to solve this problem by active outreach functions to their consumers. The Office of Economic Opportunity and other theorists expect few shifts in the first year or two of operation of the model.

The question was also raised about whether the voucher system will aid parochial schools or change them. It will probably do both. EVA policy decisions will limit their types, but some church related schools may modify their programs so as to be able to participate. Others may feel that voucher participation may dilute the process in their schools. Some parochial schools may also consider the voucher authority and reject it since teaching religion cannot be supported with public funds.

To date, OEO has not been able to sell the full model to any school district. Their hope is that the Alum Rock model will prove to be transitional. There is a possibility that many schools will adopt the successful principles from Alum Rock instead of moving to the full model. It now has the authorizing legislation to accomplish this. The organization of the Alum Rock model is flexible enough that at any time the school district can withdraw from the experiment. Obviously, if a school district withdraws within the first two years of the experiment little data will be gathered on whether the information systems, so key to the voucher model,were successful in getting parents involved. OEO has paid start up costs so that districts can continue to use vouchers after the OEO grant lapses. Many of these costs will not remain after their original expenditure. The Alum Rock model may also show the school district how to better allocate their funds.

The problems which face the California school district wanting to go into the voucher system are fairly complex. Several problems face innovators. The California educational code is restrictive so that if something is not specifically authorized, it is prohibited.

---

*A school district in East San Jose, California

The code also delineates many required functions such as length of school days and school year. The voucher authorizing bill finally died in the Senate Finance Committee. The bill showed the insight of California legislators in providing civil rights protection, hold harmless provisions, requirements for comprehensive courses in cognitive skills, evaluations, and student rights. Legislators proved sensitive to the voucher system and its vulnerabilities. The support from the chairman of the education committee in the State Assembly carried it through committee.

Opposition to the authorizing legislation came from diverse sources (many teachers' associations), but was never considered a unified force. In California the State Constitution also prohibits the school board from delegating authority so that EVA created in the transitional model is only advisary. If the bill had passed a full model could have been instituted. Although the legislation failed, the experiment is able to function this year because the transitional model does not require any legal changes, but rather makes functional changes within the system. Most states would require similar authorizing legislation for a full system.

OEO wanted to move to a full voucher model but without enabling legislation this could not be accomplished. Last summer Alum Rock went to OEO for additional training funds for staff. In January, it was decided that although the legislation had not moved, the district would establish the program in six schools involving four thousand children. In March the school board OK'd the program and the plan began to be modified. Five elementary schools and one middle school were included. It was decided to encourage, in fact, require the schools to divide up into different sections so that adequate choice options would be available. Media specialists,psychologists and other supplementary personnel were voucherized to schools also. The planning group hoped to involve as many community groups as possible. In March a conference was held to discuss implementation. Meetings produced an agreement that students could remain in their schools rather than be affected by a lottery. Squatters' rights were allowed, and special education children were included. On April 24 Alum Rock got the official contract from OEO and by June 9 the parents' choices had to be submitted. Between those dates the district had to hire and train counselors and develop and distribute information on the program. In June, with all the students enrolled in programs capacity now became a variable. The district guaranteed that the first program choice would be satisfied, if not the first building choice. A program can be defined as an over-riding philosophy of education and curriculum approach. There are twenty-two such programs, nineteen of which are different. Essentially there are seven clusters or eight to nine programs types. Six public schools are participating in the first year.

The demonstration grant for the voucher model will cost $1 million, 50% of this is for compensatory vouchers. The balance is for teachers and in-service training, transportation, dissemination of information, and overall project administration including parent counseling and local evaluation effort. None of the schools involved are Title I schools. However, 50% of the students in the schools are low income. The average per pupil expenditure in the district in K through 6 is $679. In middle school it is $966. The district is financed one quarter by local income and three quarters from state sources. The district is a high mobility district with a 30% turnover annually. 15% of this turnover is in the summertime. One third of families with children had children in different programs. The district is lower middle income with 42% Chicano, 2% Oriental, and 10% Black. Evaluations are being conducted by Rand and within the Alum Rock system. Bill Jefferds, Superintendent of Alum Rock, began the afternoon session. Jefferds stated that his interest in de-centralized school systems had been a continuing one. The year before his examination of the voucher system, Alum Rock had gone through a desegregation process which had been quite chaotic. They did some sampling and found that 95% of the people interviewed were opposed to the proposed changes. They did some parent and staff follow-up sampling on the voucher system and found that information on the system was poor. Half those interviewed did not know about it. Jefferds made the requirement that if the school was interested in vouchers it could go through a re-training process and that at any time it could still back off. Jefferds categorized the re-training process as essential. The information process which involved the local school community, model cities board and other community agencies was supportive after they had learned of the system. Local news coverage was excellent. Frank Wilkens, a principal in one of the voucher schools, also was concerned about de-centralization and making policy decisions at his level. Decision making in the new system now takes more time. As the programs were developed in Wilkens' school, teachers and parents became involved and excited. Preliminary studies showed that the children of one family have not all gone into the same program. All courses of study include mandated subjects. The principal's role has changed to more of a coordinator or adjudicator, leading participants to a decision. The voucher system in the Alum Rock system is limited by the fact that only six schools are participating. Children who do not find satisfaction in the twenty-two program alternatives may change at any time they are dissatisfied. Teachers' salaries must remain the same. They are mandated by the state. Teachers' pressures came more from national associations than from local associations to reject the proposal. The system now extends through eighth grade. OEO is not interested in testing through 12th grade experimentally; a district might want to later on.

Deciding which program to accept will be done by the parents at the elementary level, although there may be some student involvement at higher levels. The school board will make sure that regulations are being enforced. In a full model this measure of control would be considerably less. The board could veto a plan, but it is not likely that such an event will happen.

Planning on this level is complicated by the voucher system but principals have built in reserves for each school so that unexpected changes will not affect the operation of the program. Compensatory money will be used for services, or in any other way that principals and their school clientele decide, to lower pupil ratio and additional equipment. Teachers were moved according to the program choices of the students, but initially teachers placed themselves in the program they felt most comfortable. Transportation was a logistical problem which was solved by busing. So far no real performance data has come out whether the parents involved chose neighborhood schools or not. Choice patterns have not shown racial or ethnic patterns. Jefferds was asked whether or not the program would be a failure if all the children chose one particular school model. He felt that this would not be the case since the choice mechanism would still be operating. He was also asked if a child would be slowed from transferring by teacher pressure. This is a possibility, but it should be reduced with the involvement of other teachers and parents. The Educational Voucher Authority may be able to assist in this function and they would also take up the systemic problems of this educational voucher system.

Some capital improvements are being done through the voucher system. For instance, one principal in the system is using compensatory funds for more portable buildings.

Dick Holt categorized the voucher system as "something unique" because this is OEO's first experiment involving all facets of the school system. Problems are caused by this comprehensive approach in isolating cause and effect characteristics. Large complex systems tend to resist policy change and corrective efforts. Pressure points come up in strange places. Some unknowns had to be talked out, for instance, what is the school's mission? Is it an institution for transmittal of values? Or is it a mechanism to keep children out of the employment stream? What is measureable in education? How do you measure creative pressures? What does IQ measure? Obviously, these types of questions were not answered before beginning the experiment.

The purpose of the evaluation is to measure changes within the school and community and then try to define how and why changes occur. The evaluation will not define criteria for success but it has identified a spectrum of objectives against which the experiment will be evaluated. The results will probably not be available for a number of years. Rand Corporation was given the contract to design the evaluation. Dan Weiler from Rand Corporation discussed the process which Rand went through in developing their evaluation model. He began their evaluation considerations by looking at the theoretical assumptions in the model, trying to decide who is being affected by the voucher system, and identifying the affected constituencies, such as students, teachers, parents, organizations, (including professional organizations), school administrations, and boards. Additionally, he wanted to ascertain what the public interest was. The evaluation asks six questions: 1.) What if the effect of the demonstration on the education of students? 2.) What is the effect of the demonstration on the range of choice mechanisms for students? 3.) What is the impact of the experiment on educational opportunity? 4.) What is the impact of the experiment on the economies of public education? 5.) What is the impact of the experiment on the relationship of citizens to schools? 6) What is the impact on social and political tensions within the sytem? For purposes of the evaluation, the Alum Rock model was treated as a full scale demonstration.

The biggest problem Weiler spoke about was evaluating large scale social demonstrations. 1.) There is always divergence in demonstrations such as the Alum Rock model between the practice and the plan. Even if there were not a variation between Alum Rock and the complete voucher models, there would still be variations when the plan is put into effect. 2.) Program success is hard to put into real terms. 3.) In an evaluation such as this you are not dealing with a scientific experiment with controls. Social demonstrations cannot be designed with such controls. Cross community comparisons are not entirely valid, impacts of decisions like the Serrano decision might change the finance system so much that the data base would be significantly invalidated. 4.) The key program elements in experiments such as staff are not standardized. 5.) There is a messy field situation, the unknowable field variables which may effect the performance of the evaluation are ever present. The Rand solution to these dilemmas is to concentrate on pre-selected variables and avoid others. The evaluation will include parent and community surveys, teacher surveys, record data analysis, student testing, classroom observations, a sample of classroom and community observations. Rand is trying to protect the data which is being gathered in an anonymous fashion.

The eventual OEO plan is for a five to seven year program in three to five communities. Evaluation is one-fifteenth of the demonstration cost. If the program is a catastrophic failure it will obviously not move into other areas. The question was raised as to whether one-fifteenth of the total funds should be used for evaluation. Dick Holt answered saying that the role of OEO was research and demonstration operation, that the cost of the evaluation was independent of the number of children involved.

170

Speakers in the All-Day Seminar were:

1. Mr. Jeffrey Schiller, Director
   Experimental Research Division
   Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
   Office of Economic Opportunity

2. Judith Areen, Center for the Study of Public Policy

3. Dennis Doyle, provided information on the California
   legislative process

4. Elissa Feldman, Research Specialist
   Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
   Office of Economic Opportunity

5. Bill Jefferds, Superintendent, Alum Rock S.D., California

6. Frank Wilkens, Principal, Alum Rock

7. Dick Holt, Operations Research Analyst
   Evaluation Division, Office of Planning, Research
   and Evaluation
   Office of Economic Opportunity

8. Dan Weiler, Rand Corporation

--reported by Jonathan Brown
(48 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

"THE FUTURE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN EDUCATION; SOME PERSPECTIVES ON THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION"

Presentations by:

PROFESSOR DAVID K. COHEN
Executive Director, Center for Educational Policy Research,
Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

SHELDON WHITE
Roy E. Larsen Professor of Educational Psychology,
Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

Friday, October 27, 1972

Dr. Cohen spoke primarily of what society could learn from educational research and development and expressed the hope that the National Institute of Education will serve as an effort to improve the present system of educational research.

Dr. Cohen discussed at some length his participation in a 1967 task force on Head Start and Follow Through. The task force attempted, through research, to learn something about the successes and failures of these two programs. However, it would seem that the most tangible thing emerging from the research was questions: If Head Start and/or Follow Through failed, why did they fail? What was wrong with the treatments? Perhaps the treatments were not uniformly implemented in the various programs? Perhaps there are inherent weaknesses in the measurements?

In any case, one of the obvious problems was the use of the treatments. How can they be made operative; they so quickly become more like philosophies of education and less like treatments. Once they were instituted into particular programs, their nature began changing almost immediately. One cannot do comprehensive research on a program unless the treatments being employed are the same for all parts of the program. The problem may not have been so much one of poor implementation, but instead perhaps one of failing to define the treatments, thereby making it impossible to apply them uniformly. The attempts that were made to define the treatments failed to base the definitions upon any reliable, measureable criteria. There was absolutely no scientific basis for the way programs were implemented in either Head Start or Follow Through.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The eventual outcome was that both programs were working with a large number of non-exclusive, competing treatments. These were generally defined as "innovations."

According to Dr. Cohen, in the long run we simply do not know what to expect from experiments. We have no theoretical foundation for knowing, just a lot of hunches. Using Head Start as an example, we really do not know if the program will either improve a child's self-concept or if it will improve test scores. And if, in fact, it does improve test scores, we have no idea how much it should improve them.

Educational researchers must remember that it is their hopes that fail, not their experiments. Research results often demonstrate the failure of a strategy.

Educational researchers have no real basis for excluding alternative treatments; there is absolutely no definition or limit to the possible treatments that could be tried. Black language has been one treatment tried in Head Start; there was absolutely no basis for doing this and yet it was done.

Dr. Cohen went on to point out one of the dangers of educational research. When a particular treatment fails, the public tends to offer one of two explanations: either the kids are dumb and are limited by their genetic heritage, or they do not succeed because of the deprivation of their cultural background. Obviously, either of these explanations is depressing. And yet if our view is that schools 'work,' than either of these two hypotheses could be seen as correct. If we had an organized and stable conception of the process of schooling or child development, these latter hypotheses could be tested. Unfortunately, we have no such conception.

According to Dr. Cohen, society learns from educational research and development in an uncertain, often troubling manner. In order to avoid reaching such hypotheses as the above ones, educational experimentation would do well to address itself to a few ideas. To begin with, it is most essential to know more about the process of schooling and child development. Second, is educational research and development the sort of field where one can reasonably expect rapid growth? (No, it is unlikely.) Third, it seems that the right kind of experiment is the kind that is very cautious and modest. And, finally, educational experimentation should perhaps delay more research into programs like Head Start and Follow Through; perhaps we should not concern ourselves with inequality until we know more about the process of schooling.

Dr. Cohen concluded his talk by emphasizing just how uncertain everything is at this point in the field of research. We know so little, not even whether schooling works, so it is most difficult to know where to begin.

During the question and answer period the hope was expressed that N.I.E. might impose more rigor on the way we think about problems, and thereby avoid coming to some of the dangerous conclusions Dr. Cohen cited.

Tom Glennan, the newly-appointed Director of N.I.E., pointed out some of the problems inherent in educational research. Follow Through, for example, was a program that had virtually no preparation, and was therefore a program that was extremely difficult to measure in any meaningful way. Dr. Glennan emphasized the weaknesses of the various types of tests used as measures of evaluations of these programs; the measurement of skills should perhaps play a larger role than the measurement of norms. Dr. Glennan emphasized just how difficult it is to attempt to reduce inequality. Perhaps we should lower our sights a bit to the point where we are concerned with the acquisition of particular skills. If we choose skills as a thing to be measured, we may come closer to measuring a kind of change we have a chance of effecting. The type of testing must of course also be considered in the sense that, as it is now used, kids fall below a norm on a test that was designed to demonstrate a distribution. Finally, Dr. Glennan stated that he envisioned educational experiments of from five to seven years duration. It would seem that within this time frame it would be possible to establish real, workable minimums to be accomplished.

The last topic considered in the question-and-answer period was the whole idea of inequality. Sheldon White, among others mentioned how important it is to continue to mention inequality. Disadvantaged people must have some hope to hold on to, and if inequality as a concern is eliminated, that hope will be lost. Glennan responded to this by pointing out that a failure to eliminate inequality could result in one of two beliefs: either the schools are bad, or the people attending the schools are bad. Unless you make the goals of an experiment reasonable, you run the risk of attracting this kind of response.

Professor Sheldon White began his remarks by emphasizing that educational research does not know what the right questions are. In order to illustrate this, he spoke at some length about two projects that he has been involved in for the last few years.

The first of these is a consideration of what happens to the child between five and seven years of age. He has been searching for a qualitative as opposed to a quantitative analysis of this age group. Much has been written about the occurence at this age of the ability to conceptualize. This is also the age when kids go to school. One of Mr. White's considerations has been the effect, if there is one, of school on this advent of conceptual thought. On the other hand, perhaps school does not effect the change; it may be the change which makes people send their children to school at this age. Mr. White went on to detail what is happening to children at this age, and then concluded by discussing the value of such research. As he has progressed through the research process, Mr. White said he has been stimulated to ask a number of important questions about schooling. For example, what do we mean by being ready for school? This type of limited research can help one answer these questions. For example, what are the needs of the Headstart child?

The other research project Mr. White discussed was one that has been done on contract for the Office of Education. He has been asked to consider government programs for the disadvantaged child, to review the evidence, and to make some recommendations. As he has viewed different types of intervention in the life of the disadvantaged child, the first questions Mr. White asked were: Who is the disadvantaged child? Why are particular children designated as disadvantaged? In order to answer, he has developed a series of five criteria which must be used in order to identify the disadvantaged child: income, ethnicity, home environment-social class, crisis, equity. Any child identified under one of these criteria will almost always be identified under at least one other.

Mr. White went on to detail the four instances when the Federal Government will become involved with the disadvantaged child 1) to create vocational viability in future workers, 2) political socialization--to make the child more Americanized, 3) to provide day care for urban working families (to enable parents to work), 4) to provide crisis intervention.

In considering the Federal Government's involvement in the life of the disadvantaged child, Mr. White uncovered 221 government programs for disadvantaged children. No one knows who is served or how many dollars are spent. In fact, there is a great deal that is not known. One example is the number of battered children in the country; various estimates range anywhere from 6,000 to 4,000,000!

Mr. White concluded his discussion with a consideration of the role of N.I.E. To begin, there should be three levels of research. 1) analysis--policy studies, 2) program and problem research, and 3) basic research. At the first level of analysis, such questions as 'What are the social utilities of education?' should be confronted. What is going on within our schools that is actually education? What is there that can be eliminated? Mr. White sees schools as a mechanism to teach kids to think cooperatively. Intelligence tests measure precisely this ability.

Program and problem research should be a developmental effort to maximize the delivery of knowledge to children. As long as we are going to teach kids, why not teach them in the best, most efficient way possible? At this level, of analysis, a large series of temporary criteria could be developed and dealt with without having a picture of the overall process. In other words, smaller research could be engaged in without having the answers to the ultimate questions, such as 'What is the meaning of education?' Mr. White envisions that this level of research would involve 80 percent of N.I.E. activities.

The question-and-answer period exposed other possible areas for research consideration--the question of the labor market and preparation for employability, the effect of family intervention, the goals of testing. Mr. White was also asked to make some generalizations about how to improve existing government intervention programs. His response emphasized the need to consider the level of feasibility. One does not pick problems simply because they are important; one must pick them because they are ready to be and can be solved.

--reported by Sharon Enright
(79 participants)

PART IV

VIEWPOINTS: ON TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION

Many critics of education contend that much of what is done in schools is virtually the same as it was a century or even two ago. They comment that space-age advances in communications technology can upgrade the quality of instruction and can allow the teacher a better opportunity to meet the student's needs. In fact, technology may be able to take the routine instructional tasks away from teachers thus giving them more time to teach while at the same time making repetitive tasks for the student more of an enjoyable activity.

ESS programs in this area have examined communications satellites in schools, as well as video and computer assisted instructional techniques. Programs have also centered on variations in schools organization which may be brought about through the use of technology-based instructional systems.....

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "A TRUE BELIEVER'S SKEPTICAL VIEW OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY"

DR. ANTHONY G. OETTINGER
February 23, 1971

Roger Levien introduced Oettinger, commenting that experience with computers teaches respect for the complexity of the human mind. Experience with machines in education makes one appreciate the educational system's inertia.

Oettinger termed himself a "military-industrial retread" who has spent 6-years learning about educational technology. He originally studied the possibility of automatic language translation by machine, then wrote a report which pulled the rug out from under the concept. He got into education simply because he saw his own classroom as a ready laboratory for studies in information transfer problems.

"Cowing," Oettinger remarked, is what the education system tests for--it leaves little room for good "bull." On innovations in management systems, for example, PERT was merely the "rent paid to the system" when Polaris was being developed--behind all those PERT charts, plenty of free and chaotic thinking was going on. Once innovations such as PERT fall into the hands of imitators who believe that they work the way they appear, they turn to "staggering mediocrity" and stagnation.

When he first got into education, Oettinger recalled, he did a study on educational technology: "A Vision of Technology in Education." This was when he was "still feeling good" about the possibilities; it dealt with things that could be done with technology. For instance, he foresaw a global library giving anybody access to any information at any time. The problem of a "mad dictator" getting control over such a system is a problem, he said. But what he's seen tells him that we don't need to worry about it--nobody could find the control button.

Oettinger explained that he hadn't bargained on the rigidity of educational institutions, and accompanying problems of who's going to produce the technology, under what incentives, with what marketing mechanisms, what property rights, and so on. Educational technology has been characterized by "monomania"--everybody has their own pet medium--TV, CAI, etc. We need to deal with the question of what is appropriate for different media.

The speaker described his Harvard course on communications and society--to introduce technology to technology-alienated undergraduates. He read one student's critique of the course.

A comment from the floor dealt with indications that education as an institution has minimal ability to use information. Oettinger agreed that information is underutilized. He cautioned against using cost-benefit measures in education, however. What is measurable and costable, he argued, is only a small portion of what is interesting and important.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Oettinger called NIE a "great idea." He was concerned that the Levien Study had "read out" private industry.

Someone pointed out the dearth of software being developed to go with hardware. Oettinger rejected the intimation that private industry is a worse charlatan than education. He did note some difficulties--the cassette business, for example, is a scandal, he said. There is a serious problem of compatibility--you can't play a cassette on the machine of another manufacturer.

Despite a lot of rhetoric about dissemination, little has happened, Oettinger said. The private sector can be helpful here, since it has had more experience than education institutions with converting need into demand.

Questioned on the Federal government's proper role in educational technology, Oettinger suggested that the government could help deal with the problems of compatibility and property rights. The original intent of patent laws was to encourage free proliferation of inventions, not to restrict it, but copyright laws now stand in the way of proliferation in education. It could suggest specifications for educational hardware to educational consumers, he agreed.

It was noted that a very small portion of education expenditures goes into materials--why should industry bother with education? Oettinger replied that the chief question for technology in education is how to replace the staff or more effectively deploy it.

Oettinger was asked what kind of a mix of people he would pick to work on these problems. Oettinger felt if you mix people from different disciplines now, "all you will get is bickering;" a new generation with interdisciplinary training is needed. This can be undertaken in universities--there is more room for people to "bootleg" there. There must be dollar incentives for breaking disciplinary barriers. The current assult on these is seen as know-nothing, and therefore resistance is particularly high now.

Oettinger was challenged to produce constructive ideas for educational technology. He was accused of castigating educators as knaves, then retreating to the academy whose value system makes innovation easy. Oettinger replied that there is no point in wishing for simple solutions--there aren't any. He criticized promises made on behalf of NIE to spend 50 percent of the funds on immediate problems. The idea that some problems lend themselves to solution simply because they're there is an illusion. He does suggest that private industry can be helpful.

Oettinger was asked what hard questions should be put to advocates of an educational technology act. Oettinger said he would ask where the software is to go with expensive hardware. He would ask book publishers what they've done toward making cheap throwaway educational materials.

Oettinger was asked to put himself in the place of someone managing an elementary school level performance contract. What materials on the market today would he buy, assuming he'd be measured on the basis of pupil achievement. Oettinger said he'd buy past copies of the test. What if he couldn't? He'd become a cab driver. He said later he felt that talk about measuring performance on the basis of standardized tests is hypocritical in the face of rhetoric about the importance of individuality.

When asked about the need to encourage honest reporting of failure, Oettinger agreed this is a problem. Often the desire to put on a good show overwhelms scientific objectivity. One of the most important findings in research is "no significant difference."

--reported by Holly Knox

(attendance: 50 persons)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

ONE-DAY FIELD TRIP

INDIVIDUALIZED PRESCRIBED INSTRUCTION

and the work of a

REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Quakertown and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 25

I. Background, as provided by Robert Scanlon, Program Director, Research for Better Schools Individual Learning Program. Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) was first conceived in 1964 by Robert Glaser of the University of Pittsburgh's Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC). Certain premises determined the design of IPI then and continue to guide its direction today. They are:

1) The need to specify educational objectives.

2) The ability to coordinate methods and materials to achieve those objectives.

3) The need to assess student competency.

4) The need for daily, individual guidance.

5) The use of feedback to the child for motivation and to the teacher for planning.

6) The use of feedback to guide curriculum change. (IPI's research component).

Prior to the 60's, the general focus in education was on what would be taught--not on what the child in the classroom would do. LRDC set about defining behaviorally what skills a child should demonstrate as he proceeds through a given subject. One evidence of the focus at the time was the absence of directions to the child in popular math workbooks; the student was dependent upon the teacher for even this. Consequently, LRDC made an early decision for student initiative and responsibility by providing directions for the children to read.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Also evident in the examination of then available materials was the lack of alternatives for different children. In response, Dr. Glaser modified not only curriculum content and sequencing but test construction as well so that tests would serve as a diagnostic tool--to assess pre-requisite skills and measure "mastery" of skill. Concurrently, what constituted "mastery" of a skill had to be well-defined.

Instead of lesson plans for a class, lessons were to be written individually. This necessitated coding of materials and the construction of materials centers. Likewise, the premise of a feedback element determined the need for aides to perform the clerical work entailed so that teachers could remain free to perform their diagnostic and prescriptive functions.

In 1966, the newly created regional laboratory, Research for Better Schools, under the direction of James W. Becker, voted to collaborate with LRDC in field testing, developing and disseminating IPI. Robert Scanlon, principal of the Oakleaf School where LRDC tested IPI, joined the RBS staff at that juncture. The time was ripe for IPI to move from the R&D stage to commercialization. Consequently, the first goal of this collaboration became the replication of IPI in different socio-economic settings. Among the sites selected as demonstration and development schools were those characterized as black and poor; inner city and high quality; suburban and large; newly integrated; rural.

This step presented a new problem--how to train the school staffs for IPI. The strategy of training the principal to then train the staffs was devised. Self-teaching materials to instruct teachers and aides to implement IPI were developed by RBS for use by the principal at his school. This continues to be the strategy as IPI is selectively made available beyond the six demonstration sites. How it can be replicated on a large scale is now being researched.

II. The Visit to Richland Elementary School, Quakertown, Pennsylvania

Although very brief, the visit still afforded ESS guests some opportunity to see the classroom practices that have evolved from the six premises discussed above. The home room serves as "home base" for the students who move as a group to a given subject area--but in spelling, math, writing, science and reading (the IPI subjects tested here) whole group participation is non-existent. Depending upon his individual "prescription" or lesson plan for that day, a child in the reading period may be at his desk using a workbook or reading a story--or he may be

in the "Reading Disc Room" to listen through earphones to an assigned record for drill in phonics or spelling, for example. In a similar room for science, one child could be seen following directions for sorting some wooden objects into sets by size, shape or "some other reason." (The child grouped them by color and reported his decision to the aide orally.) The Science Audio Frame System 2001 may be set for rapid responses or on manual. In the latter case, a child may take as much time as he needs to complete a task. He simply presses the button marked "Push to Play" when he is ready for the next instruction.
At the end of a lesson, a child's work is checked by an aide and his progress diagnosed by the teacher who then determines his next "prescription."

III. Discussion of Richland. (Responses were made either by Mr. Scanlon or by Richlands principal, Michael Hresko).

Q. Can a child beat the system, i.e., "cheat"?

A. No. curriculum - imbedded tests (CET's) with no answers in the margin, reflect his true progress. Furthermore, many lessons require oral responses to an aide. And with all the students working on different levels, there is no neighbor to copy from.

Q. With all this freedom of movement, does anyone know where the kids are at a given point?

A. A flow chart in each classroom records the whereabouts of the children.

Q. What about automating this record-keeping and test scoring?

A. Westinghouse was developing a computer management system with us but pulled out with the current economic recession. Besides, one has to keep in mind the question of human interaction as well.

Q. What does it cost to have IPI?

A. Here at Richland and at other demonstration schools, RBS underwrites all materials and some salaries. In 260 other schools, the District underwrites the costs of IPI. The range of costs involved in adopting IPI is great and depends upon the facilities and services a school may or may not already have. For example, if there is already ample shelf and storage space or if the school is already served by aides (preferably, 1 for every 75 youngsters) then these will not be part of the start-up costs. But figuring $9 per child for the first year of math, say, and the cost of the principal's two-week absence and the teacher's 40 hours of release time for training, the "entrance fee" can range from $25 to $130 per child. These costs will drop with full-scale commercialization.

Q. Where can a poor school district get such money?

A. There are several avenues. Title I and Model Cities money are two Federal sources that have been used.

Q. Is IPI getting results?

A. Our graduates are doing at least as well on the junior high level as other students. The best students in a given junior high school are frequently IPI graduates. Our most dramatic results, both in academics and in attitude are in rural and in ghetto schools. In the latter, students on the average gain seven months over students in the control group. Arrests and vandalism which had been rampant, dropped in one year to virtually nothing. In all schools, IPI has reduced discipline problems.

Q. How will you proceed toward commercialization?

A. We will contract with existing commercializers and retain our role in training, monitoring and revising the system. We have already gone commercial with math.

Q. Are the parents at Richland satisfied?

A. The Richland district is "good real estate" because of IPI. People who move into the area are definitely attracted to Richland. More of our students make the honor roll and can be characterized as "inquiring" and "resourceful" on the junior high school level.

Q. Are Richland teachers better than others in the district?

A. Teachers try to come to Richland and the principal has a large voice in their selection. If they aren't better when they start, they certainly become better through their experience with IPI.

Q. Do Richland aides do any teaching?

A. No. Neither do they do any housework. They score tests and keep the records.

Q. How can a school get to use IPI?

A. This year, 250 schools use IPI math and 42 have the reading component. These schools qualified for affiliation with RBS by demonstrating the administration's and faculty's awareness of and commitment to the costs, facilities and training necessitated by IPI.

IV. Site Visit to RBS' Computer Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

RBS experiments with its most advanced models in a downtown Philadelphia building--a former warehouse that houses not only the RBS Intensive Learning Center, but provides classroom space for some 500 public school children from the neighborhood as well.

Dr. Becker, Executive Director of RBS, described IPI as a balance between the heavily structured lock-step curriculum of the self-contained classroom and the so-called "open classroom." He described a major goal of RBS as being able to teach the basics in only a quarter of a school day. Lack of money has slowed progress toward that goal for it has not been possible to create a truly child-centered computer with audio. Nevertheless, in striving to go beyond the paper-pencil mode, RBS succeeded in adapting business computers to teach IPI. These computers are now being used in the Intensive Learning Center by 100 students from the public schools located in this building.

Mrs. Sylvia Charp described the application of computer technology to IPI in some detail: The computer should be seen as the child's tutor. Seated before the computer, the student answers each question with a light pen. His touch records his response and determines the sequence which follows, i.e., if the answer is correct, the computer reinforces that response and moves to more difficult problems and if it is wrong, the computer may try a different approach but is tirelessly patient.

Enthusiasm for learning by computer is so great, according to Mrs. Charp, that students leave the Intensive Learning Center reluctantly. As in all IPI classes, a teacher and aide are available to assist the students.

The teacher maintains the key role of decision maker, basing her decision for a prescription on computer records of student performance. These records serve another function as well. Student tapes are analyzed by IPI curriculum writers' permitting for the first time a true cycle in curriculum development.

--Reported by Joyce D.Stern
(33 Participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES"

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

A joint group of the Educational Staff Seminar and the Health Staff Seminar visited the headquarters of the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT) for an introduction to satellite communications and the possible implications of such systems for education and for health.

A slide presentation traced the history of COMSAT, created by the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 and incorporated in 1963. In 1964, COMSAT signed an international agreement by which a global satellite system would be established on a joint basis. This agreement created the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (INTELSAT).

INTELSAT took its first step forward in 1965 with the launching of the Early Bird, the world's first commercial communications satellite. Successively advanced generations of satellites completed the initial global system in 1969. More sophisticated satellites, with greater capacity, continue to be placed in orbit.

The satellites move above a fixed point on the equator at an altitude of 23,300 miles. From its synchronous orbit each satellite can service over one-third of the earth's surface.

The communications system in a satellite consists of receivers, amplifiers, and transmitters. Signals received from an earth station are amplified and then transmitted to other earth stations within a satellite's line of sight.

Earth Stations perform two basic functions. They transmit and receive all forms of communication via satellite, and process the communications for interconnection with communications systems in the countries where they are located.

The group met in the Operations Center with Mr. Don Ross who explained the functions of the Center. The Operations Center is the nerve center of the COMSAT day-to-day control system. One of the sides of the rectangular room is covered with a map of the world with the location of each earth station and the position and lines of service of each satellite. In a well on the opposite side of the room are stationed three operators seated behind a semicircular control and communications panel.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Ross explained that the Operations Center handles the technical aspects of performing COMSAT's two major technical operating functions. One of these is direct responsibility for all United States earth stations. The other function is international manager of the space segment of the INTELSAT system.

Each nation in the INTELSAT system owns and operates its own earth stations. COMSAT's role as manager of the space segment of the operation includes a) monitoring and repair of the equipment in space, b) coordination of all television uses of the system, c) scheduling of use times and frequencies for all nations using the system, and d) the billing of users for services utilized.

As the INTELSAT system now operates services are rented on a "dedicated access" basis, a contract between two points for continuous service. Many poorer nations who are infrequent users of services are paying for unused time. The next generation of satellites will bring "demand" purchase of services that will be especially beneficial to small nations unable to reserve idle capacity, as well as to the heavy users of the system who can utilize idle capacity.

Ross said that normally only 15 to 20 percent of the capacity of the system is being utilized. COMSAT has never had to refuse a request for channel time because of overloaded capacity, although rapid schedule adjustment is sometimes necessary.

Asked about the life expectancy of the equipment in the satellites, Ross said that the first generation of satellites launched in 1965 had a life expectancy of 7 years.

The group then had a question and answer session with Mr. Steve Smoke, the education specialist in COMSAT's public relations department. The session brought out several points of information relevant to education and satellite communications.

The United States is the only nation which has a privately owned communications system. COMSAT can sell its services only to carriers specified by the Federal Communications Commission. At this time only ATT, ITT, RCA, and Western Union have FCC approval as carriers. All U.S. buyers must purchase services from the carrier rather than directly from COMSAT. Smoke said, however, that a national or global educational corporation could conceivably qualify as a carrier. There is no satellite communication service between points within the United States. The FCC has turned down repeated applications for such service.

When asked about the cost factor in utilizing satellite communications for education, Smoke responded that transmission costs are relatively cheap. He said that educational development is being held back by a) a lack of agreement about the content of educational materials, b) the cost of material development, and c) the cost of technical sending and receiving capacity.

--reported by Dave Groton
(24 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* A WORKSHOP ON TELEPRODUCTIONS USING EDUCATIONAL VIDEO TECHNOLOGY

Thursday, October 26, 1972

dta/Teleproductions, a division of dta, Inc., Consultants in Education in Washington, presented this one-day workshop as a "hands-on" experience in teleproduction. The workshop program was directed by Matt Spinello, director of communications for dta, and a nationally known trainer in teleproduction.

The morning session of the program was devoted to the opportunity for actual work with cameras, television recorders and monitors. Participants were instructed in some of the basic steps involved in planning and producing such as composition, distraction, lighting, audio/video levels and auto targets.

During the workshop, participants were provided with a two-sided approach to video television: (1) the creation of an awareness of the problems and difficulties in the use of video so that discussion of application carries knowledge of involvement, and (2) the providing of knowledge, aside from equipment, confronting the usage of video television.

In the afternoon session, the participants, working as a production team (i.e. operating cameras, video recorder and monitors) produced a video taping of a panel discussion which focused on the key educational issues involved in the use of video tape. This production effort provided a very good example of just how much effective utilization of a system is dependent upon proper application of techniques.

The dialogue which played a very important part throughout the day, and the general discussion which followed the playback and critique of the panel discussion, produced the following observations:

--The retail cost of a one station set-up for video television, such as that used by workshop participants, is about $3,000. This would include one camera, one video recorder, one monitor, and a couple of lights. For a small college, a system could be purchased for $10,000 and pay for itself in a number of years.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

--Today there are roughly one million individuals operating videotape equipment, but fewer than 1,000 have actually been trained. One reason for the shortage of trained technicians is the lack of the existence of a training center. Those dozen or so manufacturers producing this particular kind of video equipment seem to be more concerned with the single approach of "selling." This shortage of expertise has resulted in a compilation of operational problems with much blame unjustly being placed on the equipment.

--The uses to which video television may be put on a campus are only as limited as the staffs' imaginations. For example, science experiments which must be repeated term after term may be taped, resulting in a reduction in cost; lectures by visiting professors may be taped and shown at other times allowing a greater number of people to benefit from the activity; faculty members may tape class sessions allowing students who may have missed a class to view it later and, just as important, allowing faculty to improve their skills through self-evaulation.

--College faculties which are resistant to the idea of television will find that students arriving will already have had some four thousand hours of viewing experience with video tapes prior to college due to developing educational technology at the high school level. This will be an important element in forcing teachers to accept and catch up.

--Video equipment has not been standardized resulting in the products of the different manufacturers not being interchangable. However, some progress is being made to correct this deficiency. With demand, mass marketing will result in some manufacturers locking in on one system of a better quality, followed by mass production.

--Large Federal grants will not be given until manufacturers exhibit a concern for the quality of mass education and less of a concern for "mass" profits.

Some of the questions and answers exchanged were:

Q. Where is there effective use of Educational Technology on college campuses?

A. Oral Roberts University is structured around the concept of television usage, and could provide a great example. However, the University is experiencing great difficulty in effective utilization at the present. A study should provide greater insight.

Q. Is there an inter-library loan bank for video tape?

A. Yes, an example is found at Stanford University. Under this arrangement it is also possible to purchase entire courses.

Q. How are college administrators using television in the development of software?

A. Today, the idea is already being placed into use by admission offices. The field is as extensive as the imagination of the staffs. The future lies in increasing training opportunities.

--reported by John Warren
(attendance: 27 persons)

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT *
VISIT TO NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
AUGUST 3, 1970

(attendance: 16)

The tour and working luncheon was hosted by Dr. Martin Cummings, Director of NLM, and Dr. Lee Langley, Associate Director for Extra Mural Programs. An outstanding slide program conducted by Dr. Ruth Davis, Director of NLM's Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications, illustrated the Library's developing technology and projections for future communications systems employing space satellites.

The NLM contains a vast collection-some 1,4000,000 items-which have been coded and organized by computer. It provides loans, bibliographic and reference services to educators, doctors and other health professionals.

A major feature of the library is MEDLARS-(Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System). This is a computer-based system designed to provide consumers with quick references to the Library's repository of biomedical journal information. Consumers are served by MEDLARS in the following ways:

a) Publication of "Index Medicus"-a subject/author index to articles from journals all over the world

b) Preparation of recurring bibliographies

c) Conducting "demand searches" restrospective, one-time bibliographic searches conducted upon individual consumer request.

Through a communications network being developed by NLM, Regional Medical Libraries (university-based computer centers) and six Foreign Medlars Centers fill consumer demands for loans and information retrieval.

One concern of the Library is to assist doctors in isolated areas and to provide medical information precisely where and when it is needed. To that end, an experimental service, scheduled to run through December is underway at the Lister Hill Center. Called AIM-TWX, the service provides rapid searching of recent medical literature stored in a California computer run by the System Development Corporation. Selected practitioners, students, and libraries are currently testing the service.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend this meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Comments: A researcher in education views the National Library of Medicine and MEDLARS to see what application, if any, may be made to the field of education. A preliminary comparison may be made between MEDLARS and OE's ERIC. Both are computerized information storage and retrieval systems, but there are distinct differences in philosophy, scope, and capabilities.

The NLM is the central resource for National biomedical information, Its network is new and not completely operational. The ERIC system, on the other hand, is completely decentralized--there is no "National Library of Education." (One may well ask if there should be). ERIC operates through twenty Clearinghouses which are responsible for researching works in their particular fields of expertise.

Furthermore, the Clearinghouses, unlike NLM, perform a screening an evaluative, if you will-function. While all OE technical reports must go into the system, the Clearinghouses specifically select all other articles to be recorded, reproduced and stored in ERIC.

ERIC publishes monthly catalogues comparable to the "Index Medicus." In addition to the fact that the "Index Medicus" is exhaustive while the ERIC publications are selective there is another difference. The medical publication is an index while ERIC publishes abstracts. (The ERIC reports are: "Research in Education" for "fugitive" literature---speech, reports, conference papers--- and "Current Index" containing annotated journal citations).

In comparing the two systems, it should be noted that the overall NLM budget is about five times that of the specific ERIC budget.

Both systems, however, are facing the question of how to get the potential user to use the system---how to get information to the educator and the medical practitioner. The technological capacity, achievement and promise of NLM and Lister Hill are impressive; the human aspect has been less easy to deal with. Part of the luncheon discussion centered around the obvious desirablility of having medical schools focus student attention on NLM services and on changing state licensing methods by requiring doctors to be periodically tested for renewal of their licenses. Such a demand would presumably force doctors to keep more abreast of medical advances and consequently turn to the NLM communications Network. The problem of disseminating the results of OE labors-from its programs, labs, centers, etc. is analagous.

--Reported by Joyce D. Stern

PART V

VIEWPOINTS: ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

The face of higher education has changed dramatically since the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Today, over 50 percent of all students finishing high school go on to some kind of post-secondary education. The opportunities available have expanded in many new areas to meet the diverse needs of these new students and of their communities. At the same time, it is now estimated by the Department of Labor that, by 1980, only one job in five will require a college degree in our labor market.

ESS programs have focused on Black colleges, on community colleges, on changes in programs and types of students at colleges and universities, on opportunities in vocational and technical programs, and on innovative programs designed to aid students who would not normally go on to college.

ESS has also organized a series of programs on issues related to providing adequate programs for those who choose occupational rather than academic training and, more especially, on manpower policies as they relate to the Nation's vocational education programs.....

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "CONTEMPORARY POLICY ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION"

October 14, 1970

DR. HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR.
President, University of Connecticut
and
Consultant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

Dr. Babbidge was questioned about whether he had been asked to serve as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, if so, why he had declined.

Dr. Babbidge indicated that only because of his high personal regard for Elliot Richardson did he ever think of leaving the University of Connecticut; he would be happy to assist Secretary Richardson in any way he could, but he wanted to remain at the University of Connecticut. Dr. Babbidge went on to praise the Administration for their excellent, although late, choice of a most able appointment in Elliot Richardson.

In response to a question about the Scranton Commission Report (The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest) and the effectiveness of commissions generally on controversial issues, Dr. Babbidge felt the Scranton report was a good report, an excellent commentary on the problems facing colleges. It should be thoroughly read before people begin to "torpedo" it. Dr. Babbidge went on to indicate that he felt a sense of optimism about violence this year on campuses.

Q. What makes you optimistic about violence on campus this year?

A. First, the fact that there has been no violence on the campuses this fall should not be interpreted as a lack of concern in the university community; there is still a tremendous amount of concern. The contrast between the hysteria of last spring and the subdued attitudes of this fall leads toward some optimism.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Q. After Kent State and Jackson State, how do you feel about calling the National Guard onto a campus?

A. It has only been done at a few campuses and only a very few more have even considered such action. I called in the State Police only as a last resort. They were excellently disciplined, well trained and performed well. I feel it is highly desirable for the university community to control itself without aid from the outside. As for the press reports about the Administration proposals to flood college campuses with FBI agents, I think they are exaggerated. I don't feel that it would benefit colleges to have a "federal goon squad" permeating the university community, but I feel we have set a precedent: if the Congress can make violations of individual civil rights in federally-assisted institutions a federal offense, enforceable by federal agents, it can make bombings in federally-assisted institutions a federal offense. I don't like it, but it doesn't fundamentally disturb me.

Q. What would make education more "relevant" to the kids?

A. Assurance to the students that if they find that a school just isn't what they want--they are free to leave. Today it's not so. There are many pressures--a socially immoral draft policy, peer group pressures to remain in college, and a permeating social philosophy that sets a requirement of a bachelor's degree to be a prerequisite to anything of worth in the society. What we need to tell the young is that there is a natural uncertainty at your age, take your time, it's your life; you decide when and if you want to come back to college and we will guarantee you have a place.

After all, what are the purposes of higher education institutions?

--to help young people find their identify;
--allow educators and professors freedom to work with their ideas;
--preserve the best of the past, and--though we don't acknowledge it--to keep young people off the labor market.

Q. What can the Federal Government do to advance the cause of higher education?

A. In some respects, it is more important not do do, than to do

It is the job of the University President and the Board of Trustees to keep order, and repressive federal legislative that would require special action by the university can't help. As for positive things, the Federal Government could make sure anybody who wants to can go to college. We might consider giving everyone a "liberation grant" of $10,000-$25,000 to start his (fully adult) life; to go to college, buy a car, to start a business, or to get married, but let the individual decide.

We as a society can't afford to pressure the entire society into the educational system. The young should be given the choice as to where they want to go--they are going to have to live, so let them decide.

Q. Where are colleges going in the future?

A. We have seldom made significant progress in reforming existing institutions. We need new institutions. The junior and community colleges are the land-grant schools of 100 years ago. When we created Land-Grant Colleges we didn't throw away Harvard or Yale. We added a new dimension; that's what we need now--new institutions with new dimensions.

If business or proprietary institutions are better, why not give them a chance? They may be more sensitive to the needs of the students.

Q. Would you cut aid to old institutions to give more to the new schools?

A. I agree you can't just give money to existing institutions--everyone says so (Kerr Commission, etc.), but one of the benefits of affluence is the ability to duplicate efforts and select the best from the competition and I feel that is is necessary to experiment.

Q. How do you feel about the Free University concept?

A. It provides a test competition between current interests and established interests. It's a vehicle for changing the standard program. Free Universities balance student demands for change against the system's rigidity.

Q. Discuss the financial crisis in higher education.

A. It's very real! Colleges are no longer the golden boys. We are flying less high and we will be facing more tough priority decisions. Institutions are truly captive of the guild system. They are self-protective. Salaries won't go down but newer functions like Public Services, Extension Education, etc., will suffer from financial cutbacks.

Q. More about the way Federal Government should change higher education legislation?

A. The most offensive thing about federal policy is that it tends to be "preachy." Design your federal policies to accomplish educational reform, but don't preach.

Secondly, we need institutional support only after sufficient student support so that every student who desires an education can have it.

--Reported by William Cable
(38 Participants)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*
FIELD TRIP TO PROJECT NEWGATE, ROCKVIEW STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA

Tuesday, December 1, 1970

(attendance: 16 persons)

In June 1969, the College of Human Development at the Pennsylvania State University (PSU) and the Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections formulated Project NewGate, a program to prepare selected inmates for entrance into colleges and universities.

History and Objectives

The concept behind Project NewGate originated when PSU established its College of Human Development. Under a grant from National Institutes of Health, the College was to design new programs that would allow the University to collaborate with existing state and federal agencies for the improvement of social problems by integrating research, education and public service. Then, with a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections sublet a contract to PSU for the inception of Project NewGate. "The Project is conceived as a vehicle to gradually reintegrate prison inmates into the general community by providing expanded social and educational opportunities. The underlying hypothesis is that increased educational, and legitimate social, alternatives within the prison setting and the free community will decrease the options for further criminal behavior."

When members of the ESS tour arrived at the State Correctional Institution at Rockview, they were greeted by Dean Donald Ford of PSU and Dr. Joseph Mazurkiewicz, supervisor of the Rockview Institution. Dean Ford briefed us on the origins of Project NewGate as well as its connections with PSU, and Dr. Mazurkiewicz presented the views of the Bureau of Corrections.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

According to Mazurkiewicz, the philosophy of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Corrections is to prepare men for their reintegration into the community. Because Rockview is Pennsylvania's only minimum security prison, the Bureau of Corrections is willing to experiment with new methods for the improvement of the state's correctional process.

In addition to preparing inmates for college life, the Rockview staff is using Project NewGate to study behavior modification. Dr. Matthew Israel, Rockview's behavior specialist, explained that Rockview not only seeks to improve the quality of life for its inmates when they leave the compound but also hopes to create a more pleasant environment within the prison walls. Using self-recording scales, Dr. Israel is measuring the quality of life inside Rockview in order to determine modification of behavior. By exposing inmates to NewGate, Dr. Israel believes he can alter their behavior patterns by surrounding them with new role models. In this way, the new environment would compete with and hopefully replace the behavior patterns brought into Rockview, while teaching the inmates self-management.

Selection of Participants

The inmates selected to participate in NewGate were drawn from the entire Pennsylvania inmate population. NewGate staff members developed basic criteria and then canvassed county, state and federal prisons looking for inmates with average or better intellectual capabilities. In addition, these inmates had to be men who could be housed at a minimum security prison (thus eliminating anyone with an escape-attempt record), and men with sufficient time left before parole to benefit from the program.

Inmates were informed of Project NewGate through their prison counselors or with notices on bulletin boards. Also, correctional officials were asked to submit the names of possible candidates. After receiving the necessary information, the Project NewGate staff interviewed the potential candidates. From the final list of qualified individuals, Project NewGate selected 50 inmates at random. These men became the experimental group; a control group was also selected, but in order to maintain the unbiased nature of the scientific experiment, the men in this category were not informed of their status.

The staff of Project NewGate divided the candidates into three classes. The first included 10 inmates with high school diplomas and with the potential to rapidly fulfill college admission requirements. It was also necessary that these men have at least three months remaining in their sentences. The second class consisted of 20 men who had completed tenth or eleventh grades and who had at least one year before parole. It was hoped that these men would receive their GED's and complete at least two college courses during the first year of the program. Finally, 20 slots were allocated to men who had not completed the tenth grade and who had to serve at least two more years. By the end of the first year, Project NewGate officials hoped that these men would receive their GED's and meet college admission requirements.

Courses

Students without high school diplomas were allowed to proceed at their own pace with programmed learning courses. Since many inmates had been "under-achievers", their learning was re-enforced with financial rewards for correct answers and rapid progress. While the sums were small, NewGate officials hoped that such rewards would stimulate interest and produce results.

Students who were ready for college work were given their choice of basic freshman courses, taught by instructors from PSU. Inmates were permitted to carry as many as three courses per quarter, but many elected to reduce the load by one course. Each student was assigned a study booth in the new Prasse Education Center on the Rockview compound, and the prison library was supplemented with the necessary books. The NewGate staff instituted several informal courses, designed to prepare the inmates for college classroom participation, and tutoring services for GED and College Entrance Examinations.

Completion of the Program

After their sentences expire, inmates in NewGate have the opportunity to enroll in college, either at the main campus of PSU or at other selected institutions. NewGate officials arrange for the enrollment of the parolees and provide them with a small stipend to help pay tuition, room and board. NewGate also arranges for temporary housing until the men can become situated in the university community. Sixteen of the 18 students who have graduated from NewGate are currently enrolled in college.

Problems: Administrative

NewGate has faced many problems in its short history. Dr. Mazurkiewicz identified its major hurdle as the necessity of relating Project NewGate to the rest of Rockview. As a full-time experiment, NewGate is designated the "work-assignment" for the inmates involved. Charges of "special privilege" have been leveled by other prisoners; this opposing position is easy to understand. While the regular prisoners are working in the fields, NewGate candidates are studying.

Funding also presents problems. Project NewGate must renew its OEO grant annually. This annual funding can put undue pressure on an experiment that may take several years to mature. Thus, Bureau of Corrections officials and the NewGate staff must constantly search for contingency funds to insure the program's continuance.

Collaboration with state and federal agencies can also prove difficult. Bureaucratic regulations often hinder the necessary flexibility of such a program, and when individuals from the various agencies and institutions must share activities in new ways, tensions and misunderstandings can develop.

Limiting NewGate to an enrollment of 50 excludes many qualified inmates. It also cannot give women prisoners (there are approximately 300 in Pennsylvania) equal opportunities for educational advancement. Inmates in medium and maximum security prisons must also be excluded.

Problems: Social

After the initial presentations, the ESS members spent most of the day discussing NewGate with selected participants and staff members. We were divided into three groups and each group had the opportunity to speak privately with three prisoners. Later in the afternoon, we met informally with several PSU students who had completed NewGate. In these conversations, this writer was able to gain deeper insights into the effectiveness of the program as well as some of its problems.

Inmates currently enrolled in NewGate face the task of adjusting to academic life within the confines of a prison environment. Their studying must be done under severe regimentation and pressure, and they have very little time to "unwind", as one inmate expressed it. Most of the men in NewGate have had very little schooling, and they must learn to adjust to a schedule that consists mostly of reading, writing and studying.

Study conditions are far from optimal for NewGate participants. The inadequate lighting of the cells and the noise of the cell blocks make evening study difficult.

To alleviate this problem, Rockview officials have granted the students special permission to leave the block at night and work in their study carrels. While studying and traveling to and from the study hall, however, these men are escorted by prison guards.

Some inmates in the Rockview prison have come to resent those in NewGate because they assume that special privileges are being granted. To counter these charges, Rockview officials assign Project NewGate students the most menial tasks during school breaks. At the same time, NewGate students face hostility from the guards. Resentful that their children may not be able to attend college, many guards feel that prisoners do not deserve an education. Unfortunately, this feeling does not lead to cordial relationships.

There is also little time for interaction between NewGate students and other prisoners. Thus, many of the positive aspects of the program are lost through a lack of communications. The overall prison population, however, has gained in small ways by the presence of NewGate (expanded library facilities, availability of typewriters for typing courses, etc.), but in general, there still is misunderstanding. As the program continues to develop, NewGate staff indicates that every effort will be made to produce benefits for all inmates in the institution.

Racism, which is apparant at Rockview, is not as overt in NewGate. There is unenforced racial segregation in the dining room, and when a black prisoner attempts to get food from the "white line", he is often intimidated. When members of ESS passed the mess hall during the lunch hour, the segregation was obvious. The blacks were sitting on one side of the hall and the whites on the other. This writer saw no other visual signs of racism, and only the mess hall situation was discussed with the inmates. However, the overall impression gained is that racism, while not as blatant in Rockview and in Project NewGate in particular, as in other prisons, still produces conflict and tension among the inmates.

The inflexibility of the correctional bureaucracy has produced several situations for the Project NewGate staff, mainly with regard to reading material. While pornography and revolutionary literature are forbidden, almost any book may be placed in the library, so long as it does not have an erotic cover. Inmates cannot subscribe to Playboy, but Cosmopolitan is on the approved list. James Joyce's Ulysses is also available, if one looks under "history".

Problems of Released Participants

Some of the more serious problems are faced by the released NewGate students. In their new college environment, they are faced with social and intellectual readjustments. These students must also comply with stringent parole regulations (Pennsylvania has 17 such rules), which often place unnecessary constraints on their lives as members of the university community. While many parole officers attempt to understand the position of the students, some, like the guards, resent the opportunity afforded to these "ex-convicts". For example, released NewGate students cannot associate with parolees other than their roommates. This regulation, of course, eliminates socializing with friends made in the NewGate program and hinders joint study ventures. Similarly, the released prisoner's attempts to reestablish normal personal relationships are made more difficult by the regulation that prohibits them from entertaining women in their apartments (or being entertained by women). Restricting the use of alcoholic beverages is also a regulation, and the degree to which it is enforced depends upon the officer involved.

One final problem faced by the released NewGate students concerns their future. Pennsylvania Correctional regulations forbid the hiring of individuals with prison records. Thus, NewGate students who complete college and want to return to the prison community to aid other prisoners are prohibited from doing so by bureaucratic regulations. Every student in NewGate (both inmates and parolees) approached by this writer expressed a desire to return to the program in an administrative capacity. They feel their experiences would provide them with an excellent grasp of the problems facing prison inmates. Yet, current NewGate participants were frustrated by the existing prohibition.

The continued success of Project NewGate will depend upon the efforts of its staff, their ability to maintain funding, and the willingness of the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections to remain flexible and to experiment with new ideas. NewGate has had an excellent beginning, and despite its many problems, it is showing meaningful results.

--reported by Michael Weinberg

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
Affiliated with Washington Internships in Education

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
PRESENTATIONS OF DAVID IFSHIN, PRESIDENT, AND DON SHALL, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1971

Returned a week and a half ago from visits to Moscow and Hanoi as part of a NSA-sponsored delegation of student body presidents and student government leaders which attempted to negotiate a "peace treaty" with North Vietnamese students, Mr. Ifshin commented on NSA's twenty-third conference's determination that the war is still the main issue confronting American students. He also touched briefly upon his impressions of North Vietnam and the Thieu-Ky regime of South Vietnam.

As a leader interpreting demands and problems, Mr. Ifshin contends he learned much about education in North Vietnam, a humane society, in contrast to the dehumanization of society prevalent in the United States. He found the pre-industrial society decentralized with individuals having control over their own lives.

University students in North Vietnam are concerned about control over their lives, but not over such things as curriculum. Members of the board of trustees were men respected in the educational world. Mr. Ifshin found university students in the U.S. comparable to people on welfare, discontented but lacking control over their university environment. He claims that the present campus quiet is ominous. As long as the university defines its role solely as assisting students in achieving economic goals there will be no campus quiet. Corporate change is necessary although activism on campus may not begin again for two or three years. He sees the largest campus problem as the increase in drug usage furthered by the lack of an outlet for student grievances.

Mr. Ifshin sees three options for society; one is to break the student insulation and recognize the contribution students have to make. The second is to follow Vice President Agnew's advice and repress the students. The third option is to ignore the problem completely.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Asked what his values would be if he could restructure society, Mr. Ifshin said he did not have a blueprint but that he would change the private enterprise system and decentralize society to allow decision-making over one's own life. There is a need for leadership in a time when there is a race war and no feeling of progress, as well as a need for cooperation in solving problems, as opposed to solutions which are solely in one's self-interest. In short, he stated his goal as a desire to change the corporate state.

Democracy, though lost here, is a good start to solving the leadership problem. He said that North Vietnam has democracy which is modeled after the United States. Control over decisions and priorities remains at the local level. He conceded that NSA, his own organization, is a corporate structure, lacking democracy, but that changes are in the making.

Mr. Ifshin defined humanizing as sensitivity toward certain people; dehumanizing as removal from human existence. Students moving to the country does not solve the problem although it is a revolt against dehumanization. Students no longer view the function of the university as an economic function, i.e. preparing careers for gainful employment.

Asked what he wanted quantitatively, Mr. Ifshin replied "a move toward involvement." While student involvement in campus politics had fallen since last year, the vice-president, Don Shall, replied that numerically campus turnout for elections is very low: often only 15 percent, and seldom more than 30 or 40 percent of the students vote.

Asked if he found a communication difference between himself and those attending the dinner, Mr. Ifshin replied that he saw the choice as humanism versus participatory democracy. There is a positive need for communication; it is impossible to communicate experience.

When asked for practical solutions, he said that he was not denying technology as there is a real challenge in unifying technology and the human spirit. At the present time he feels that technology has won out.

To Mr. Ifshin, Joe McCarthy was the same as Wallace or Cleaver, a challenge to the power structure, but the corporate structure stopped them. This structure, which is firmly in power, does not operate in students' interest.

Mr. Ifshin was asked if there was anything one could do to assist the universities when one was no longer a student. He called for exertion of outside pressure in behalf of university change; the country now lacks consciousness toward any solution. Told that more progress is being made than he was willing to recognize, Ifshin contended that the changes are not real progress because the end result remains the same: credits to get a degree to obtain a job.

Don Shall said he would like to see an end to the war in Southeast Asia. Secondly, he would like to heighten consciousness in more than two percent of the university students. Third, he would want universities to be full of people who are there because they know what they want, not because society had channeled them there. Fourth, he would like a restructuring of priorities.

Ifshin answered that he had been pessimistic in his remarks, but to claim to have the answers would be arrogant as well as undemocratic. Ifshin feels that wo years from now the situation will be worse. Students want leadership. Mr. Shall viewed the most importantthings to be done by university trustees to be an examination of their motivation for action and a definition of the universities' purpose as well as the student's role in the university.

Mr. Shall felt that universities should continue receiving aid as he sees education as the highest priority. Those who criticize the university must avoid being used as a tool to destroy the university.

Mr. Ifshin was asked if it was not arrogant on his part to hold himself out as a spokesman for students. He replied that he does not claim to speak for all students nor does he have the solutions. He relates his perceptions after four years of personal observation.

Asked if society might benefit if the university and society were separated--if the "citadel-for-truth" function was separated from the instrument for social change--Ifshin did not see the answer as a simple separation of the two functions. What one learns in school does not have to oppose the truth in society. Ifshin concluded that we must develop alternative systems to respond to the problem.

--reported by Susan Garber

(attendance: 45 persons)

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* "THE MOOD ON CAMPUS: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNIVERSITY AND FOR SOCIETY AT LARGE"

DR. LATTIE COOR, VICE CHANCELLOR OF WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, (ST. LOUIS)
GERALD GRANT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Coor stated that campus problems must be seen as also problems of the society-at-large. He characterized the mood on campus this year in the following way:

--Ominous Silence, which shouldn't be read as a capitulation to the norms of society, but rather as an exhaustion of the spirit. In the upheavels of the past two years many moderate students found that society's institutions were very vulnerable and are sobered by that knowledge.

--Anger, which is based not only on fundamental objections to the policies of the government, but also to the norms of society. Statements such as those in Reich's The Greening of America on the profound alienation of youth from society are an accurate reflection of student attitudes.

--Loss of Faith in the Establishment, reflected in generally negative attitudes toward the Federal Government and university administrators. A recent Louis Harris opinion survey found that 66 percent of the Nation's students felt that the President had not been honest about the Cambodian invasion and 73 percent felt that the President was not credible overall.

--Affirmation of the Youth Culture, reflected in the predominant feeling among young people that their generation is responsible for social change and that they can achieve change by standing together.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Grant observed that it is important to recognize how small the student counterculture really is. Scammon and Wattenberg's The Real Majority confirms the fact that the Nation's young people are, on the whole, predominantly quite conservative. Another study conducted by the Carnegie Commission found a high coincidence of student and faculty opinion nationwide on such subjects as the quality of the curriculum and campus disorder. Disagreement between students and faculty came on such issues as grades, the need for reform and campus governance.

Grant also noted a form of puritanism among the young, manifesting itself in an inability to act except where action is based on ideological conviction. For many young people, the moderate is the great enemy.

Among the encouraging signs Grant found in his visits to college campuses were a moderation of anti-intellectualism among young people, a turn away from hard drugs on campus, and a growing attitude among black students in favor of integration rather than separation.

Nonetheless, Grant predicts that there will be basic changes in our value structure resulting from youth culture--notably, a high need for achievement which will be directed at social rather than material ends; basic changes in the family structure, perhaps toward a more communal form; and new forms of political participation

The most important problem for the immediate future, Grant said, is how the dominant culture will absorb the counter culture of the young. Among the solutions he proposed were an increased understanding and tolerance and a great respect for pluralism; an effort to make campuses responsive to the whole community rather than the exclusive preserve of the young; giving more significance to experience in the world of work; and creating communal experiences for young people after high school, offering them a chance for service to the community.

Coor began the discussion by observing a surprising consensus among the young in favor of work experience in addition to education. Grant said that this may be a constructive outlet for the guilt students frequently feel "at taking advantage" of their parents and educational institutions. This guilt frequently manifests itself in accusations against the institutions.

Asked if the unrest among high school students, frequently growing out of the authoritarian structure and racial tensions, was amenable to the same kinds of solutions as those suggested for higher education, Coor replied that the same basic problem applies in both cases: the lack of meaningful choices for young people. The situation might be improved by offering high school students world of work experiences in addition to their education.

One participant opined that many high school students might be better off outside educational institutions.

Asked how he would account for the puritanism of students at the more elite institutions, Grant responsded that Kenniston attributes it to a finer moral sensitivity among the young and a tendency toward the requirements of total commitment as a measurement of morality. The concentration and separation of students from the rest of society might also account fro the puritanism of the young. He added that large numbers of young people who have college graduate parents are insecure about achieving at the same level.

One participant sensed that the speakers were putting the burden of responsibility for change on the student rather than the institution. Coor responded by saying that institutions must change because they are presently in the untenable position of being asked to play God with the futures of students. Many students don't presently choose to come to college but do so because it is expected of them. Institutions should change to make themselves only one of several alternatives. If higher education becomes mandatory, it will become even more coercive.

A participant questioned whether society could provide jobs for students as an alternative to higher education. Coor responded that society must change, perhaps by giving more emphasis to social service, to give students a sense of worth rather than by excluding them from the labor market.

A participant said that there is tendency among community colleges to aspire to become comprehensive institutions instead of focusing on vocational and technical education. Career and vocational programs are presently excluded from the mainstream of higher education.

Another participant cited an example of the present inflexibility of institutions of higher education: many institutions have had Upward Bound programs in operation for three or four years without admitting students from them into their regular academic program.

Asked if the public had shown a willingness to support experimental institutions, Grant answered that the counterculture and experiments in education will continue to exist regardless of broad public support. However, some experimental colleges, i.e. Antioch in Columbia, Maryland, have given a great deal of attention to the cost-effectiveness of their operations and have moved out into the community to capture resources.

Asked if Grant's analysis of the student counterculture applied to minority students, Grant replied that minority students tend to be much more goal- and achievement-oriented, and they attach much more value to success in college. Coor added that his experience confirms a deep attachment among minority students to traditional academic values.

A participant noted that many who argue for more vocational/technical programs do so on the assumption that they are for other people's children, accepting the assumption that such programs are educationally inferior. Is it possible to break through this stigma? Coor answered that one way might be to publicize more attractive jobs requiring vocational/technical training.

Grant argued that one successful model of career education is the College of Human Services, established by the Women's Talent Corps in New York City. In that setting women are employed part-time while receiving training and their teachers act as advocacy agents, urging their advancement into meaningful jobs.

Coor added that such programs need not be exclusively vocational; they could also provide for lateral entry into college. He asked members of the group if it were possible that some initiative might come from the Federal Government to provide more educational options for young people.

A participant said that there was a need for concrete proposals. The problems may not be in the inflexibility of the labor market, but rather in resistance to competition with traditional college programs.

Another noted that an underlying problem hadn't been discussed, e.g. credentialing. Perhaps external degrees, granted outside the existing academic structure without formal college instruction, could provide an alternative to the existing system.

--reported by Richard Elmore

(attendance: 33 persons)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
DINNER WITH BLACK COLLEGE PRESIDENTS
March 9, 1971

President Herman Branson, Lincoln University, Penna.
President John A. Peoples, Jr., Jackson State College, Miss.
Dr. Wendell Russell, Virginia State College

President Branson, the first speaker, emphasized the Black colleges' contribution to America, while pointing out that the colleges have received very little support from the government or other sources. The major concern at this time is finding the support needed to continue their tradition of education and service. President Branson is especially concerned that this "stance" of the Black colleges -- over a century of service, indeed, until 1954 the only real avenue for developing Black leadership, with a minimum obligation from government -- be made known to the American people.

Federal legislation discriminates against black colleges, and new legislation is needed to change this condition. There is a lack of return to Black colleges, and new legislation is needed to change this condition. There is a lack of return to Black colleges in proportion to the number of students as compared with White schools. No money is provided for the costs of proposal preparation or other management related to the prospective grant, and these costs must be met by the college.

The position of the Black student in the White college is difficult. Frequently he enters on a remedial basis, a position which may continue until he drops out.

The Black colleges need help to influence public and institutional giving. President Branson urged that we forget the romanticism and give kids a chance.

President Peoples stressed the image of the Black college since they have suffered by the Riessman-Jenks study, similar research. A Newsweek reporter at Jackson State appeared set to develop an "instant demonstration," such was his mindset about reactions to the shootings. He was supplied with accurate information and then incorrectly reported the facts. How the Black colleges are seen by others remains a problem.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The first concern for legislation should be the issues involved in doing the real job of the college. Legislate federal monies into direct support of the colleges.

Black colleges are too often a legislative afterthought, and they are hurt by the standards inherent in the legislation. For example, prerequisite spending standards as a qualifying requirement for new funds mean that colleges with histories of low spending (because of no funds) cannot qualify. The indirects costs of small grants are proportionately higher than those for large grants, which militates against the effectiveness of the grant procurement process. Loans are available at 9%, and there are problems for state schools in getting them. Since the fees and tuition are less at Black colleges, they spend considerably less than White schools. This, too, affects their position in relation to federal grants.

President Russell began by pointing out that there are a good number of disasters connected with Black colleges because they are treated as Black. In these judgements the unique mission and tradition of these schools is overlooked. They have fulfilled purposes different from the White schools.

America, President Russell pointed out, is a compassionate and ingenious nation, able and willing to deal with all the world's disasters -- except in America, especially the Black colleges.

Virginia State College must combat the effects of this attitude. It has the second highest tuition of any college in Virginia, yet it is a state college. And the students must pay for what the State won't! Indeed, decisions about allocations are made at the State level, but Virginia State is not represented at that decision level; hence, it is left out when choices are made.

President Russell felt the Black colleges could use more HEA Title III funds and money for facilities.

Black colleges lack political clout. Frequently their officials find themselves shunted from decision-makers to lower level officials who know little about the program and less about Black colleges. They promise letters, but the letters never come...

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

The USOE libraries' policy was explained. These monies are being massed for institutions having the most "direful" need. Someone pointed out, however, that even this approach is "fundamentally dishonest" because the program's appropriation is only 1/3 of the authorization.

A study of the utilization of Black college graduates was suggested. Could alumni give to institutions if better employed? (This relates to the general acknowledgement of the underutilization of Black graduates). This suggestion was not accepted by the Presidents. The college returns to the society something it doesn't pay for. Besides, in White institutions only very rich alumni give.

Negroes can't do innovative things. The task of maintaining and continuing present program goals requires more resources than are presently available!

Question: What do you identify as the major deterent to a lack of federal funds?

What is needed are schemes that would create criteria so schools can get at basic support to do the job. In terms of justice, a good place to start would be general institutional support.

Local politicians run on a platform of "Let's defeat HEW guidelines." This means federal regulations must specify the nature and direction of support.

One speaker pointed out there is something worse than the Black college plight. The general high school curriculum, especially the "keep still and graduate" syndrome, cuts Blacks out of a chance for college. This is the real tragedy of Black education today.

Question: Where do you get the best treatment for your institution, from state programs or federal grants, or others?

ess EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 801A. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
A VISIT TO THE
WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

4100 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C.
April 2, 1971

Washington Technical Institute was created by Act of Congress (Nelsen Bill, P.L. 89-791, November, 1966). Title I established the Federal City College and Title II created WTI, a two-year community college to meet the technical and vocational education needs of the District of Columbia. WTI's Student Handbook lists two principal objectives: to provide complementary and alternative educational opportunities leading to employment--including basic and compensatory education, psychological services and in-depth occupational counseling, as well as work experience and skills training; to serve as a catalytic agent in providing career development opportunities within the municipal and Federal job structure.

We were met by a congenial and impressive host, President Cleveland L. Dennard, who told us how WTI is achieving its stated objectives. Programs at WTI fall into three categories: research and demonstration grants for specific projects (VOICE, Volunteer Opportunities in Community Education, ADELANTE, working with Spanish American professionals to overcome language and other barriers so as to handle professional work in the U.S., etc.); contracts with Federal and/or D. C. agencies for inservice upgrading (specifically, the Police, Fire and Corrections Departments); and, the largest operation, the vocational training school.

Dr. Dennard commented on WTI's general approach in determining where the staff and organization can be most effective. In accepting contracts, for example, WTI believes it can be most effective in working with staff development, rather than operating at the individual program level, i.e., it can get more mileage from an effort to improve the quality of corrections personnel than by operating a vocational education program in Lorton.

President Dennard discussed in some detail the factors involved in the decision of what vocational education programs are to be offered, the percent of commitment to each vocational area in terms of staff, space, and equipment, the varying admissions requirements for students as affected by the number of slots in a given program and the particular applicant's goals. For example: the criteria for selection (and only 1 in 3 applicants is admitted) include academic experience and/or work experience, personal interview results, diagnostic testing, and transcripts from previous educational experience. Since there is a relatively arbitrary assignment of the number of students in a given area, based partly on WTI's capability, and to a larger extent on the job market in that field, and, since applications run much heavier in high-status fields such as business technology, nursing (R.N.), aerospace technology, etc., an applicant seeking one of the less popular areas (such as environmental science technology) has a better chance of being admitted.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

There was a very active question period, ending only when Dr. Dennard called a halt in order for the group to participate in a campus tour. Some examples of questions:

Q. What percentage of enrollees actually complete two-year course?

A. Can't be precise, because of shifting objectives. Students frequently take a break, reduce or increase course level, come in on an inservice program and decide to go for an associate degree, etc.

Q. How many associate degrees awarded last year?

A. Two hundred eighteen associates, 503 certificates, against 650 full-time enrollment in the fall.

Q. Grading system?

A. Pass - means performance at acceptable level in all "behavioral objectives"
High Pass - above and beyond acceptable.
Incomplete - this eventually becomes a "fail" if student fails to bring it up through additional work, etc.

Q. Does percent allotted to each study area have relation to job opportunities or does staff limit the openings?

A. A little of both.

Q. Are internal transfers possible?

A. Yes, both possible and reasonably frequent.

Q. How about outreach program?

A. Largely through counselor and staff contacts in district high schools.

Q. How does percent of emphasis in specific areas respond to changing needs? How are you avoiding the "locked in" problem of many similar institutions, maintaining flexibility?

A. Through periodic up-dates; present plan is projected through 1975. The ideal situation would be a no-campus arrangement where students spent their learning time at cooperating institutions in a complete work situation. This would avoid the "locked in" problem. However, students like the campus situation.

Q. How about transfers to other institions?

A. WTI is different from most community colleges in that they do not seek to provide the first two years of a regular liberal arts program. However, they have arrangements for transfer of certain credits to neighboring colleges and universities.

Following the discussion period, ESS participants, in groups of two or three with one or more student guides, visited many of the six buildings on the 20-acre campus. My guides were two young women studying to be radiologists. Theirs is a two-year course with three days on campus, two days in hospital work during the first year, and the reverse the second year. They spoke of the problem of uneven preparation level of the students and the availability of special tutoring help as needed. One of the girls explained that she was an unmarried mother of a one-year-old and a three-year-old. After each child she had tried going back to work at low-paid jobs, but found she couldn't earn enough to manage and reverted to welfare. Through counseling at the Urban League she was directed to WTI and is now finishing her first year. A combination of aid supports her and her children and provides day care for her children. I was impressed with her motivation in the face of a rigorous schedule. For instance, on the three days she attends classes at WTI she leaves home at 6:25 am in order to get her children to their sitter, and rides by bus to the campus for an 8:30 am class.

We visited the health technology building, well equipped with more or less standard laboratories and classrooms, the computer technology area, and finally, the media center. At the latter there was an impressive array of sophisticated equipment including closed-circuit TV and master tapes for each class with an arrangement so that the student can add his comments to the teacher at the end of the tape. One "interview class" was being taped on closed-circuit TV. This would have been a speech class in my day in college, with the advantage of an instant re-run to point up areas needing improvement. (My two guides, however, admitted they had made use of the facilities only two or three times.)

My overall impression was one of motivation and enthusiasm permeating both staff and the students. WTI is apparently providing vocational education's classic goal -- "a bridge between man and his work" for the enrollees. The placement record for graduates to date is 86 percent in qualified jobs -- and that's hard to fault. Whether WTI can maintain this record in a less favorable job market remains to be seen.

--reported by Trudy Wright

(attendance: 19 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* VISIT TO CAPE FEAR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Marine Technology and Marine Laboratory Technology
Wilmington, North Carolina

Monday, June 28, 1971

Arriving at National Airport bright and early on Monday morning, the group boarded the plane just before nine o'clock and then had the privilege of sitting on the runway for twenty minutes while a violent thunderstorm passed over. Since the Chinese believe that rain at the beginning of a trip is a good omen, it was welcomed, and the trip did prove to be profitable as well as interesting!

In Wilmington, North Carolina we were met by staff members of the Cape Fear Technical Institute and transported to the Institute where we were given a historical background of the post-secondary vocational education efforts in North Carolina by Mr. Tony Bevacqua, Education Director of the Department's Division of Occupational Education. One of the most impressive points made in this presentation was that students are free to make multiple entries and exits into the post-secondary vocational education training program, that it is viewed from the very beginning as continuing education and that it may be quite reasonable for many of the students to have to interrupt their education with some frequency to earn additional money to continue, or for some other reason.

The post-secondary vocational education act was passed in 1957, and North Carolina massively over-matches the Federal government's contribution to vocational education. Mr. Bevacqua felt that North Carolina had demonstrated a very great commitment to vocational education. He noted that a great many of the programs take into them students who would be classified as functionally illiterate since they have not done very well in the North Carolina public school system. The vocational institutes attempt to practice what they preach by starting with the student where he is, and taking him as far as they can in a specific period of time. He felt that they had been very successful in upgrading many of the students' basic competencies in the areas of reading and arithmetic. He said that they were particularly making an impact with that group of students who would not normally go on to four years of higher education, although he did note that many of their two-year graduates then transferred to other institutions of higher education. He did indicate that since none of the vocational-technical institutes in North Carolina have yet been accredited, it makes it quite difficult in many cases for students to transfer their course credits from one of these institutes to other academic institutions.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The vocational institutes in general are open from eight o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock at night and on Saturdays, and there are many adults coming in and taking courses. One of the particular strengths of the technical institutes is that they do not run all of their courses at the institutes, but, in fact, have a number of mobile labs which they move around the state to run the courses where the people are instead of making the people come to them. This is true, for example, with welding classes.

With reference to the earlier comments about the lack of basic skills that many of the students have, we were told that to disseminate information about the institutes, it turned out to be far more practical and reasonable to use radio or television rather than trying to use the newspaper as the method of carrying the message to the people. A very extensive recruitment activity is under way and most of it uses audio or video methods of contacting the populace, not the more conventional newspaper.

The president, Mr. McLeod, indicated that there were a vast variety of programs being offered at the Institute and that they trained all of the firemen, policemen, and many employees of similar social agencies in the immediate area. He also indicated that there were extensive programs for mothers and housewives. He stressed that there was a very marked transition from agricultural types of Institute courses to those concerned with industry. There are approximately sixteen hundred full-time students and 11,000 part-time students.

The major portion of our stay was concerned with the examination and study of the marine technology program. The Institute provides training in the areas of oceanography, marine biology, fishing industries, engineering, and deck personnel for ships, in both merchant and pleasure crafts. It is a two-year program, and one which extends beyond the state boundaries of North Carolina. They have acquired from various government surplus warehouses a variety of boats. They have one boat named the Advance II, which is a 185-foot ex-Navy patrol escort. They have a second boat, a 110-foot ex-Coast Guard rescue salvage tug boat, and a 145-foot ex-salvage tug boat, and a large number of smaller boats. The students in this program obtain actual experience at sea, and the boat that we went down the river on had just returned the night before from an oceanographic expedition.

They are concerned with environmental projects such as monitoring water and atmospheric conditions, making fish counts, and similar marine investigations. One of the comments of the captain of the ship was that it is very difficult to provide modern training in these areas when they have to use ancient vessels such as those that they have obtained through surplus property. He asked the group to consider with great care the possibilities of providing more modern equipment for technical institutes of this kind.

We had lunch on board the ship, then cruised down the river. We were perfectly free and encouraged to talk with students on the boat; most of them indicated a great deal of satisfaction with the program. They did, however, indicate that the dropout rate in the Institute in general and in their particular program was very high. Some indicated that it had exceeded 70 percent. These dropout rates made some people wonder whether the Institute was not suffering from a common problem, that of attempting to become like a four-year accredited institution rather than one which served a very different set of needs than this.

At a pleasant evening meal we had an extended period of time to chat with the various faculty members of the Institute. All in all, it was a very enjoyable day and I was most impressed with what seemed like a very productive and really forward-looking program in the area of vocational education.

--reported by Gilbert Austin

(19 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"INSTITUTIONAL ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION A CONTINUING EXPLORATION"

Tuesday, February 15, 1972

Resource persons--

James Hester, President, New York University
Virginia Smith, Associate Director, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education
Alexander Astin, Director of Research, American Council on Education
Allan Ostar, Executive Director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Frank Newman, Associate Director for University Relations, Stanford University

Hester discussed the basis of institutional need--construction costs, costs incurred as a matter of public policy (e.g. minimum wages and unemployment benefits). If the Federal taxpayer benefits from the institution, he has an interest in its survival.

Newman felt the pending legislation is of great significance, but that there has been no serious debate concerning its implications. Both the higher education community and the Congress have taken the attitude "strike while the iron is hot." He felt one question which has not been asked is "what kind of institution do I want to see as a result of aid," since he does not believe it is a Federal responsibility to keep institutions alive. Basing institutional aid on credit hours can have significant unintended side-effects.

Astin felt reformers are perceiving institutions' financial plight as a device for institutional change. He disagreed with the industrial analogy that institutions should be allowed to die.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Smith felt the Federal interest in higher education should be more clearly defined. Too much attention has been paid to mechanics and techniques for getting money to institutions of higher education. She felt if higher education is to receive increased levels of funding from public sources, new methods and means of accountability must be found. This might impinge on institutional autonomy. Not enough attention has been paid to the interrelationship of new funds and existing programs, including effort requirements.

Ostar discussed institutions of higher education as a national resource, and the extent of Federal responsibility for their support. He analogized general institutional assistance to the original land-grant legislation. He discussed the effect of the project-grant approach on institutions.

Hester felt higher education is interested in its own reform. He felt there has been substantial debate on institutional aid among certain people. He did not feel that any form of general aid adopted by the Congress would freeze the future form of higher education.

Muirhead (OE) discussed the national interest in strengthening public and private institutions of higher education. He questioned how such policy can be reflected at the State level, such as by instituting purchase of services programs. Newman questioned whether national policy should be made by the Federal Government. Hester felt Congress and OE should not decide what institutions do. Newman agreed that institutions should determine their own responses to national priorities, but stressed the need for incentive. Hester agreed with the concept of incentives, on top of a basic floor.

Smith commented that land-grant funds were passed in a time of increasing State revenues. The same will not be true of Federal general aid. She suggested that incentives should be related to areas of Federal interest or national policy; other activities could be funded from other sources.

Ostar questioned whether one approach might not be Revenue Sharing or Federal assumption of other State expenses, such as welfare. He felt part of institutions' problems is the existence of Federal incentives; he stressed the need for a base.

A. questioned why a Federal base is viewed as a constant source of funding, since no trust fund approach is contemplated, Hester suggested permanent legislation. Astin commented the basic problem is that the basic pot of existing aid is too small, as a result of competing priorities. He urged that institutions need accountability to demonstrate their successes and gain additional funds.

B. questioned whether the time has come for institutional aid; Hester spoke of institutions threatened with closing. Would either pending bill help those colleges? Newman agreed with the questioner, feeling that the problem has not been sufficiently addressed.

Should general aid be used for replacement or expansion, or both; is unlimited expansion desirable? Ostar felt that institutions are the best judges of their needs and capacities. He felt the existence of a lay board of trustees is important.

A participant asked for a definition of accountability. Smith felt accountability should encompass how well an institution utilizes funds.

Newman commented that general aid is seen as layered on existing resources, in an age of ever-increasing costs. He noted that State finance directors see Federal aid as a relief fund. Astin questioned how it is possible to police maintenance of effort in public institutions, stating he felt they did not work.

A participant commented that the House bill would provide up to 45% of the operating budget of some small institutions; 21% of the eligible institutions with less than 2% of undergraduate enrollments would receive 4.5% of the funds. Hester questioned the figures. A participant noted that more than 600 institutions enrolling less than 500 students will receive substantial amounts per student under the House bill at full funding.

P. questioned whether tuition, State aid, and institutional gifts shouldn't constitute the base. Hester felt a new base is needed. Newman felt a shifting base of support may be desirable. Ostar questioned whether this wouldn't create a vast Federal bureaucracy.

Q. asked the cost of the solution to the problem of institutions which are going bankrupt. Hester said the higher education community is moving on various fronts; he did not feel a single national solution would be desirable. Newman felt that private higher education serves an important function since it is independent and provides an element of diversity. A solution must enhance autonomy and diversity--his solution was to borrow the tuition differential between public and private education.

Astin felt one problem is that States have not addressed the problem on a systems-analysis basis. Newman felt private institutions should compete with public with differential tuitions, but that the gap should be reduced. Hester felt general aid would enable institutions to reduce tuition.

R. questioned whether faculty salaries wouldn't eat up institutional aid. Hester felt such pressures would apply to any new money, but felt the real need is to reduce deficits.

S. asked how public support for increased aid can be generated in the light of decreasing faculty teaching loads. Newman expressed concern about broadly-based institutional aid without incentives to the institution to reform itself. Smith agreed that institutional reform could effect sufficient saving to obviate much of an institution's need for general aid. Hester agreed that such reforms were necessary while general aid was in force. Ostar pointed out that public institutions, which cannot run a deficit, have to keep afloat by increasing enrollments.

T. commented that the Congress is more willing to exert Federal control in connection with higher education, and that as colleges become a national resource they may fall under the State action provisions of the Constitution. Hester disagreed that higher education is unconcerned with control. Astin added that the Federal Government is concerned with ends rather than means. Newman agreed that Federal control is a significant danger, citing the health manpower legislation mandating uniform accounting. Hester felt attempts at Federal control cannot be avoided, but felt that general assistance would be the greatest assurance of institutional autonomy.

U. questioned whether all States have reached their fiscal limits. He questioned whether colleges may not have to close to arouse public sympathy. Hester felt institutions are being encouraged to cut costs by forces far greater than general aid proposals.

Smith reiterated that the pricing gap between public and private institutions is a severe one. Nothing in pending legislation would ease the situation, and the freeze on tuition might exacerbate it. She felt an effective institutional grant program should address itself to the factors that have brought about the crisis. She also felt that false dichotomies on the question of formula have been created, clouding the issue of the best means of getting funds to colleges. There are a number of options between narrow categorical aid and general aid--perhaps what we need is broad categorical aid. She agreed that maintenance of effort is important, but felt it most important at the Federal level.

Ostar felt it was important that higher education associations are united on the approach to general assistance, even though wedges are attempting to be driven between them. V. pointed out that interests of different associations are radically divergent, and credibility is impaired if associations represent a united front position antithetical to their own. W. added that credibility is further impaired when individual institutions oppose the position of their association.

Ostar felt that once general aid is established he would take his chances on its continuation. X. felt that this did not meet his anxieties.

Y. questioned whether anyone has proposed reimbursement for the costs of providing national benefits. Hester felt a 5% override for costs of meeting national priorities would be reasonable.

Ostar felt other worthwhile legislation has been developed as a response to crisis. Z. felt that neither general aid provision is a response to crisis. A. felt any program is merely a first step. Hester felt his institution first needs to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

B questioned why Hester was wedded to a specific proposal. Hester felt this proposal represented the best interests of higher education. He questioned why people oppose what is a realistic solution to higher education's problems on narrow, philosophical grounds, as any proposal can be attacked on some philosophical basis.

C. felt the Congress was on the verge of a major new thrust in the area of higher education, including a major public discussion of the needs and goals of higher education. Congress will not appropriate large amounts of aid for higher education without being told what colleges are going to do with the money and why it should be of higher priority than other uses. The Congress will probably move in the direction of career education and education with a more egalitorian character.

D. indicated concern about where the higher education community will be in requests for institutional aid v. student aid in the next budget process. E. questioned whether there will be any significant new money in future budgets. Smith agreed that the budget impact on existing programs must be considered.

Ostar felt it was the job of higher education institutions to make the best case possible, while the Congress sets priorities.

Members of the group felt that the issue of priorities had to be considered by the higher education community. Ostar felt HEW should undertake systems analysis to assess the potential effect of various mixes.

Hester asked why it is unrealistic to talk of large amounts of new money. The group felt that this was unrealistic in the light of budget deficits, higher education clout, and other calls on the Federal budget.

--reported by Jean Frohlicher
(attendance: 43 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

"COMMUNITY COLLEGES: UNEQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY?"

Principal Speaker:	Thomas B. Corcoran, Research Associate, Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse University
Reactors:	Dr. Marie Martin, Director, Community College Programs, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education
	Dr. John Mallan, Director of Programs for Servicemen and Veterans, American Association of Junior Colleges

Thomas Corcoran spoke from the basis of an 18-month study of community colleges and what he terms their "unequal educational opportunity". Corcoran looked at: the quantitative pattern of growth in community colleges; the question of what is meant by "equal educational opportunity"; and the increasing numbers of community colleges and how they relate to the total education picture. In doing this, he developed a conceptual framework for assessing the hierarchical structure of postsecondary education and the community college.

The study identified several major factors in assessing the contribution and weaknesses of the cc system: (1) participation opportunities; (2) curriculum relevance - content of education - does it meet the needs of the clients; (3) curriculum flexibility (problem of choice for client groups in terms of changing needs); (4) effective participation--what is the correspondence between what is learned and what is set forth as objective; efficient participation--cost-benefit ratio; recurrent participation --access over time to people of all ages, providing new opportunities, etc.

---

*This is one of a series of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The question asked, then, was "Is this really the best way to provide educational opportunity for the general public? The goal, as Corcoran defined it, was equal access, equal services, equality of choice, elimination of age discrimination.

Using available data (and this is relatively minimal, considering the extent of the institutions), Corcoran found:

a. a segregation pattern by race and income
b. tracking
c. less resources available (this varied greatly from state to state) to do a greater job because of remedial needs of students
d. great variation from area to area because of dependence on local tax bases

Conclusion: a student who aspires to a BA or BS--asked to attend a community college rather than a 4-year college--has: less resources available to him, less competent fellow-students, less effective teachers.

Recommendations by others:

14-year built-in system with students assigned as per public school.
California system--4-year colleges become upper division, community college, lower division.
Carnegie Foundation: turn community colleges into technical institutes.

Mr. Corcoran reaches several conclusions as a result of his study, recommendations to redistribute educational opportunity through strengthening existing institutions. These were:

(1) Provide some form of residential opportunities. Possibly the federal government could provide money to allow for building hostels to bring small groups of students into college for intensive experiences, workshops, etc. Removing people from their environment helps make change possible. Present community college resembles an educational drive-in.

(2) Research and teaching should not be separated. CC need this use of a "renewal center" approach put within the cc context. This would start needed dialogue, and attract better faculty.

(3) Faculty exchanges - between 2 and 4-year colleges.

(4) Career education concentration in cc, with a consequent move away from looking on all students as potential BA's. This, in practice, has had the effect of postponing any career commitment.

(5) National study to assess different models in different states. (Corcoran identified at least six major college-types)

Marie Martin responded with additional emphasis on some of the problems cited and a defense of the community colleges's achievements in certain areas. She emphasized two major problems: (1) finances--cc are getting less than their fair share; and (2) too many people for the space and equipment available, too many people who are not innovative and who are there because they have rejected degree campuses, too many people who are critical without offering constructive alternatives.

On the question of access, the open admissions policy has brought lots of problems, but by opening the time frame many were served who might not be otherwise.

John Mallan agreed with the other two speakers on the data problem, and the difficulty in measuring such factors as attrition and whether a given student had succeeded in his particular goal (which may have no connection with a degree). He also pointed out the importance of non-school factors in determining success of cc students, and reminded us that the cc inherited a greater share of accumulated learning deficits than most post-secondary institutions.

Mallan quoted one study as indicating that the cc was serving as a means of upward mobility for lower middle-class white students, that a number of institutions were developing leadership among black or Spanish-speaking presidents, and that they were moving away from traditional, remedial education, to special services and were filling a real, if different non-traditional need.

Some additional comments from participants:

--Although there was no data to suggest that comprehensive institutions were best, there is some data suggesting that a one-purpose institution was more effective.

--While the community college may give less, it is the only available opportunity for many participants.

--We must recognize the heterogeneous quality of community colleges, and the difficulty in characterizing them.

In summary, the speakers agreed that our present community college system does not offer the equivalent opportunity for the degree-aimed student as does the average 4-year college. While it serves other needs for other kinds of students, these accomplishments are hard to measure. What is needed is to find means of reducing the present inequities and capitalizing on the great potential of the community college concept.

--reported by Gertrude Wright
(42 participants)

Note: This meeting will be followed by another program on community colleges:

"NEW HOPE FOR COMMUNITY: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE; A REPORT ON PROJECT FOCUS," with

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer
Executive Director,
American Association of Junior Colleges

and

Dr. David S. Bushnell
Research Director, Project Focus
American Association of Junior Colleges

Wednesday, April 26, 1972

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"NEW HOPE FOR COMMUNITY: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE; A REPORT ON PROJECT FOCUS"

EDMUND J. GLEAZER
Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges
DAVID S. BUSHNELL
Research Director, Project Focus
Wednesday, April 26, 1972

Gleazer discussed how Project Focus originated. He characterized the 1960's as the "Golden Years" for education; community colleges doubled and their students tripled; many state systems also developed. The Kellogg Foundation funded the study with Gleazer doing field interviews at 25 institutions and with 1500 people. He also visited 20 State capitals and boards who deal with higher education. Project Focus was not designed to evaluate individual institutions, rather its purpose was to provide a more general study of the 850 public and 150 private junior colleges across the country.

Gleazer mentioned 5 elements considered in the study: 1) What kinds of change ought to take place in community colleges across the country in relationship to the target population served? Gleazer interviewed faculty, students and community people to gain their perceptions. 2) What type of programs and services must be offered to serve the needs of the students? 3) What changes are indicated in the locus of power at the institution? 4) How should community colleges be funded? 5) What should be the relationship of colleges and their communities?

Gleazer summarized his findings using the 5 categories.

Diversity of Population: More students are enrolled in community colleges for several reasons. The community colleges enroll older students (in Phoenix women over 25 enroll in large numbers). Gleazer felt that community colleges have grown up because of: A) the negative attitudes present in many state legislatures toward 4-year colleges, B) the growing attractiveness of the community colleges, and C) the low-cost attraction of community colleges.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

They are able to enroll a widely diversified student body broader than the comprehensive high school because of the additional factor of age differences in the student body. Community colleges are also able to serve as retraining centers for the population. They are providing education to new groups in society. The colleges frequently are required to start-up in a very short time period; this increases the levels of frustration of all those in the community colleges. Faculties are often not included in the planning phase.

Locus of Power. Gleazer commended state legislatures for their growth in understanding of issues. He felt that power and funding was moving toward a state-wide system. The state agency to deal with developing that system and handle the problems on a comprehensive basis is becoming more and more the norm.

Finance Questions. Gleazer felt that the student load should be minimized. The Serrano decision has destroyed the property tax as a base for financing new systems. States are saying that if the federal government will take over health and welfare functions then they will be able to afford to finance education.

Bushnell discussed his back-up research survey to Gleazer's field research. Bushnell developed a survey which went to 90 institutions, 12,000 students, 3,000 faculty, and 1,000 presidents. His goal was to gain a background of the institution's populations, as well as variations in the perceptions and goals of persons connected with the community colleges.

He categorized the future for community colleges as one of relative stablity because of the end of the war baby boom. He felt that we would see a continuing upgrading of these colleges. The community colleges evidence a strong concern for jobs. Concerns of the community colleges will change as the age of clients changes. With a 50% increase in the number of young adults entering the labor market in this decade the role for the community colleges will continue to grow. 50% of the students in community colleges are part-time students. They want more aid. Currently 10% receive educational opportunity grants and federal loans. 20% draw on the GI Bill. 9% of the Caucasian, 18% of the Black, and 28% of the Mexican-American students come from families with less than $5,000. family income. The satisfaction rate among Mexican-Americans, Blacks and Caucasians reach 70%. Orientals and American Indians reach only 50%. 25% of the students transfer and do well.

Questions.

1. Is a 10% survey adequate (for the Bushnell survey)?

Yes. Especially with the response by survey respondents (92 out of 100 Presidents surveyed responded).

2. At what point in the school year was the student survey done? It would make a difference if it were done before or after the drop-outs.

The survey was completed after April and May, at a time when most early drop-outs have left school (a large number of students drop-out in the first months of classes).

3. What are the major areas of growth for the community colleges?

A. With a more diversified age group in the student population, an emphasis is being increased on "life-long learning."

B. The community college's interest in employment preparation should grow. As it does, the institutions will move away from the two year college idea. There should be alternatives to the AA degreee as well as other kinds of certification. Reprogramming will obviously take place.

4. In regard to the wide range of previous academic performance of the students at community colleges, what are the methods of skills upgrading for poorly prepared students (some with only 4th grade skills) and what is the success rate of these students? What is the drop-out rate for minorities?

Malcolm X College in Chicago enrolls large numbers of students with inadequate preparation. They do not use the concept of a remedial course; rather they utilize volunteer teachers to help upgrade skills. Black studies is used as a motivation tool.

B. Large concentrations of minorities enroll in community colleges especially in urban areas. Some resent the community colleges; others have a pride in it. In Illinois, the retention rate is so good that there is a question of where do students go from the community college. Malcolm X has recently established a cooperative program with other universities in the area.

C. 50% of the students drop-out, but there are many re-enrollments. Gleazer commented that he felt that drop-out rates were not applicable because of the continuing nature of the educational process in community colleges. Different students obviously have different goals and some goals are not met. Gleazer reiterated his concern that we need more data on the goals and objectives of the institutions.

5. What is the mission of the community college as a distinct segment of the total higher education community?

Gleazer stated that he felt that the primary role should be to provide educational services which are not presently available in other areas. Gleazer emphasized that the community college cannot do everything. The state system should be comprehensive, not the community college. Bushnell commented that he felt that all lower division students should not be encouraged to go to two year colleges first.

6. A. What is the level of dissonance between boards of trustees, executives of the colleges, and state governing boards?

Boards are becoming more involved in institutions than previously. Review has become an on-going function. The relationships between chief executive officers and state boards vary.

B. What is your vision of the direction of the community colleges; which group's point of view is emphasized within the colleges; is the view shared or supported by the communities?

Bushnell commented that the primary goal of presidents of community colleges relates to the needs of students served, stressing occupational preparation and adult education. The students stress financial assistance needs and student participation in the decision making process. The faculty stress their role in the decision making process. In the four year colleges, faculty involvement and research operations are mentioned most often. Gleazer stressed that community colleges put more emphasis on the student while the four year colleges stress process.

7. A. Do you think you offer equality of educational opportunity compared to the four year college?

This was not a part of the study. Knoell and Metzger's study said that community college students do transfer effectively.

8. In Washington State the Comprehensive Planning Board has one member (of 10) representing the community colleges even though they have 55% of the enrollment; are they getting the short end?

In some states, the state supplies 6% of the operating budget for two year colleges and 27% for the four year ones. Clearly this lack of emphasis on community colleges by state boards must change.

9. What is the working relationship of community and four year colleges now and in the future? Do community colleges operate in isolation to four year schools?

Transfer students are where the community college does its best job. There is a distinct lack of acquaintance of goals of the non-transfer student. The community college is poorly linked to the secondary school because they wanted to separate to upgrade their image.

10. A. What are the number of high school drop-outs entering junior colleges?

5-10% of the student body. In some states, adult basic education is a part of the mission of the community college.

B. What is the effect of the community college on the world of work?

For some, the community college is a desperate bid to escape a dead-end. Others have not clearly defined their goals and would like to defer them so they won't get trapped. French and Sommers' study found that the value-added earning power of a community college education is 18% over the vocational high schools and 14% over the technical institute. There is a tendency to separate education and preparation for employment. Gleazer commented that the president of Arizona State proposed the establishment of a community agency where a student out of high school would register and receive comprehensive pre-employment and employment services The community college presently performs part of this function.

11. What is the attitude of the faculty toward preparation and their needs for training?

There is a real lack of information among faculty in community colleges about federal programs. Many in the faculty want to get away, but not all want to get back to school. One third of the faculty are presently upgrading their skills (60% of those are working for their PhD). Academic programs are not always relevant because they stress research rather than the learning process.

12. There is great concern that too much is being planned for;the community colleges hope they won't be planned to death.

Bushnell questioned how we could deliver mass education without planning. There is some real diversity between colleges across the country.

13. The uniformity in some states is extreme. In Illinois a fountain is required on each campus. How do you lessen this impact?

The community colleges are able to work around requirements like the California requirement for 55 percent of the budget spent on faculty salaries.

14. What kinds of public aid should be developed for community colleges in the future?

Funding patterns for community colleges are not really adequate to accomplish goals. Services are the first things dropped in times of short money. Many students need more financial aid. Comprehensive services required for the community college (including counseling, learning labs, day care centers) are more expensive than those required in a four-year university. Capital outlay is not as important for community colleges. Bushnell categorized the '60's as the decade for hardware and the '70's as the decade for software. He estimated the cost of education at community colleges to be $1700 per year.

15. In order to upgrade the community colleges could one utilize Ph.Ds "caught in the surplus?"

A. The Ph.D must have an interest and commitment in the community college.

B. He must be prepared to teach--many are not teachers.

C. He must be able to speak the language of the students.

D. He should have work experience outside of the academic world.

--reported by Jonathan Brown
(26 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

A REPORT: "THE COMMISSION ON NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY"

DR. SAMUEL B. GOULD,
Chairman of the Commission,
Vice President, Educational Testing Service
President, Institute for Educational Development

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

The Commission on Non-Traditional Study is co-sponsored by the Educational Testing Service and the College Entrance Examination Board. It is supported with a two-year Carnegie Corporation grant which was effective February, 1971. The purpose of the Commission is to review recent developments in higher education reform and to make recommendations about what may, could and should happen.

The Commission is now in its final stages. The final meeting was scheduled for the end of June, 1972. The conclusions and recommendations of the members will be put together into a final report which will be distributed for reactions and then published. Since the Commission had not agreed on the specific conclusions and recommendations of the report at the time of the dinner meeting, the views presented were those of Dr. Gould.

Dr. Gould characterized the 70's as an "Age of Reassessment" in education from which new concepts were evolving. The three major concepts we discussed were: (1) that education should be organized for the convenience of the student rather than the convenience of the institution; (2) that knowledge, training and competence are not acquired through existing education systems alone, and (3) that the community may be a better focal point for organizing education than the university. Dr. Gould believed that these three concepts pointed to the way of the future in education. He also felt, however, that traditional education would not disappear; but its importance would be minimized in view of the total educational environment.

Dr. Gould also pointed our some significant issues which he felt needed more consideration and attention in view of the rapidly changing higher education scene and the lack of

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

(over)

systematic planning, development and evaluation that has been associated with it. These included:

1. That full educational opportunity is now a possible and desireable reality. Post secondary education should therefore be organized in such a way that this is provided.

2. That since the emphasis is now on flexibility and diversity in the modes of study in higher education, the options open to the individual are increasing rapidly. Therefore, attention should be directed to insuring that non-traditional study develops in a related system of post-secondary education.

3. That a problem-solving, multi-disciplinary approach to learning could serve as an alternative to traditional approaches.

4. That since individuals mature at different rates, programs of study should differ accordingly. A continue of learning should be developed with life-long learning opportunities.

5. That since individuals learn according to different styles, new curricula should be developed.

6. That with so many new approaches being developed in non-traditional study, appropriate evaluations and safeguards to quality should be developed.

Dr. Gould saw the value of the commission in bringing to light some of the reforms that are happening in post-secondary education and making recommendations so that as change takes place it will happen with proper planning and quality control.

--reported by Jane Hannaway
(52 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

VISIT TO THE FASHION INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

New York, New York

Friday, October 20, 1972

The Fashion Institute of Technology is a community college in the State University of New York system with a special mission - to provide its students with instruction in all areas of the "fashion industry." If there was one thing which every member of our ESS group shared on our visit to FIT, it was probably a perception that everyone concerned with this school - administrators, faculty, and students - knew what that mission was, knew why he was there, and was busy achieving that end.

FIT enrolls about 2,200 full-time students and nearly 3,000 part-time and evening students. Courses available to these students encompass all areas of fashion. "Fashion" in this case is defined as more than just clothing, but as a lifestyle.

Course work is broken into two major classifications - the Art and Design Division and the Business and Technology Division.

In the former division, students take courses in advertising design, display, fashion design, fashion illustration, fine arts, interior design, photography and textile design.

The Business and Technology Division's offerings include advertising and communications, fashion buying and merchandising, management engineering technology, textile and apparel marketing, and textile techonology.

During the morning of our visit, we broke into small groups for a tour of the FIT facilities and a chance to meet students in their classes.

Among the activities we visited were classes in fashion design, interior decoration, knitting technology, fabric design, fashion photography, and the textile testing laboratory. Some tid-bits picked up along the way:

- A surprisingly large number of students (perhaps 25%) in one class indicated that they already had a bachelor's degree. Most of these degrees were in the humanities and many of the students had been unable to get jobs with only an undergraduate degree.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

- There is a tremendous shortage of knitting machine mechanics. The instructor to whom we spoke told us that persons trained in this specialty are currently making between $21 - 45 thousand per year.

- Without exception, every student to whom we spoke liked what he was doing. No one felt he was taking a course simply to satisfy a "requirement."

- Expenses for a resident student are about $2,200 per year for N.Y. residents, about $2,700 for out-of-state students.

- A great number of the FIT faculty are actively engaged in the fashion industry, in addition to their teaching duties. Most felt that this insures that their students will be learning current techniques and needs.

Our morning visit was followed by lunch with FIT personnel and the Chairman and President of the Educational Foundation for the Fashion Industries.

The Foundation was responsible for the establishment of FIT and still contributes quite heavily to its support. Among other things, the Foundation is currently providing about $100,000 a year in student aid.

After brief remarks from several members of the faculty and administration concerning some of the activities at FIT which we had not seen, the session was opened to questions.

In response to a question, President Marvin Feldman noted that FIT was a beautiful example of the fact that private industry and public education can work together to provide students with a broad education.

When he was questioned about his perception of the Federal government's role in technical education, Feldman responded that he believed that the Federal government ought to pick up the incremental costs necessary to provide a national skilled manpower pool. Currently the State of New York pays FIT $600 per student per year. Feldman maintained that, as Federal and State governments aid institutions increasingly on a per capita basis, schools are tempted to drop high cost vocational and technical courses and to concentrate on providing lower cost courses in order to reap the maximum benefit per enrollee.

The students who were present were asked their opinion of FIT and its course offerings. All of those who responded were quite favorable.

Generally, the students felt that financial aid available to them was quite adequate, although one student who was a photography major said he found that his work-study and outside work necessary to support the expenses of this major left him little time for school activities.

Feldman noted that about 25% of FIT's students are from minority groups.

When asked how he would use new Federal money, Feldman listed curriculum development, research and development, and faculty education as his top priorities.

Feldman did not have much hope for the Statewide Postsecondary Commissions authorized by the Education Amendments of 1972. He cited political and financial problems as reasons and said that he felt schools would hesitate to participate in cooperative ventures so long as they receive money on a full-time equivalent enrollment basis.

Finally, in reply to a question about FIT's enrollment, Feldman said that the school had accepted about 25% of its applicants this year. He noted that he would like to have more males enrolled; currently about 20% of the student body is male.

--reported by Richard A. Hastings
(30 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
"OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA"

September 13 to September 15, 1972

Touch down Tulsa, dusk, 7:30-ish. We were greeted at the airport by Dean Wayne Miller, Dean of Oklahoma State Tech and Vice President of the Oklahoma State University at Stillwater and his administrative staff: James L. Moshier, Assistant Director, Administrative Affairs; Ray L. Dyke, Assistant Director, Business and Finance; Dr. W. W. Hobbs, Assistant Director of Academic Affairs; Frank Kubicek, Jr., Assistant Director, Campus Development and Maintenance and Grady W. Clark, Assistant Director, Student Affairs. These men were to be our constant companions during our stay at Oklahoma State Tech (OST). From the Tulsa airport we were chauffered to Okmulgee (Creek Indian for bubbling water and home of the Creek Indian Nation Capital) by Okmulgee businessmen and members of the Chamber of Commerce. It was a delightful ride. We were divided into small groups to make this short trip and it seems each of us was given a deluxe tour of the area. These men were proud of Okmulgee and OST and they demonstrated this pride from the very first moment we met them.

After the drive we checked into our Travel Lodge Motel. A small informal reception was given for us at the motel by our hosts. It gave us an opportunity to become acquainted with Oklahoma State Tech's hospitality and personnel. We had our first encounter with Wayne Miller. What can I say about this man, he is energy personified. He is capable, congenial and well organized, on top of being a well respected administrator both at OST and the Oklahoma State University.

The first evening ended fairly early and Wayne promised to see us bright and early the next morning. Appropriately we were shuttled from the motel to the school in a small school bus. When we arrived on campus our hosts met with us again and off we went...the tour of OST had begun. The Tour centered on OST's departments. We were free to ask any questions of our student guide or any of the students we happened to observe in the departments. Everything was extremely well organized leaving us just enough time to tour almost all the departments. Before entering each department a small two page pamphlet describing the courses and department was distributed to us. The pamphlet included information on the number of instructors, the 1971-72 school year enrollment and the number of graduates, the number of classrooms, labs and shops, the ratio of hours of theory to lab work, the money evaluation of training aids and the graduate job prospects. The pamphlets were designed and printed by the students. They were quite beautifully done and were just one of the many products designed and made by the students. (Even our name tags were student-made). After viewing about half the departments in the morning we had already been impressed with some features of the school. I'd like to touch on a few of these right now:

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Students:
Student enthusiasm for the school was an almost pioneer-type school spirit. They exuded enthusiasm for building OST, as if it were their baby. Most of the students who attend OST are from Oklahoma and live on campus. Racial background of the student body is 74 percent white, 11 percent black, 14½ percent American Indian. Age ranges from 17½ to over 36 with about 85% of the student body between 17½ and 25 years of age. About 75 percent of the students enter Oklahoma State Tech with four years of high school. A few OST students have had four years of college. The student's family income background ranges from under $3000 to over $12,000 with 50 percent of the students coming from families making under $6000 a year. Most of the students we spoke to had heard about OST from friends or relatives, guidance counselors or the media. Many of the students we spoke to expressed the feeling that they were "not good enough for college" so they chose vocational training. Many also expressed concern for immediate employment objectives after they completed OST. OST instills visitors with a feeling that the students learn pride in workmanship and professionalism as well as skills.

OST encourages practical "hands on" experience for their students. This is evident in all of their projects. Students perform repair mantainence functions on campus. However, their talents are not limited to repairing ready made products; they create some beautiful products on their own. The shopping mall is a working example of their design and creative abilities. Located on campus this mall houses several interesting shops and services. There is a drycleaners, upholstery shop (furniture and automobile), bakery (every one bought something in this shop) and a leather shop where you could get anything made from belts to hand-tooled leather saddles. The cost for these services for faculty and students is computed on the cost of materials plus a minimal charge for overhead costs.

Faculty:
We were free to roam around their labs and workshops and ask any kind of question concerning the curriculum,equipment and general course objectives. Most of the faculty members have had years of experience in their occupational field. A very noticeable feature of the faculty in this particular vocational school is their ability to give the student independence in problem solving in the lab and workshop situation. They were readily assessible in case the student needed guidance. Their teaching philosophy was "learn by doing." In this type of situation the students could work at their own pace, were free to consult with fellow students and probably as close to the real work environment that they could be exposed to while still in a lab or workshop. My general impression was that many of the instructors followed the example of master craftsman to apprentice rather than teacher to student. Many of the teachers at OST suffer a pay cut to teach at the school but their rewards seem to be finding an education challenge and feeling the prestige in being a

faculty member of OST.

Services:

After walking through many departments and wishing we had more time to spend with the students in each department we took a lunch break. Our lunch was prepared by the students (or course)...even the placemats,napkins and matches on our tables were designed and made by them. We walked into the Tech cafeteria and we were greeted by our own student host. The Buffet was a real example of the quality and creativity of OST students. At the head of the table was an ice carving of the United States highlighting Washington, D. C. and Okmulgee. Everything was meticulously and artistically prepared. I found that the students and faculty of the culinery arts had been working on this luncheon for four days. Attention to detail was almost beyond belief. There was a bread basket made of buns and filled with four kinds of breads and muffins. Students had designed a relish tray molded in the form of a fish with sliced radishes serving as the decoration for the fish scales. Every dish was unique. Students prepare a buffet each Thursday. It is open to the public and well attended. After we all made the hard decisions of what was to fill our dinner plates, which now seemed the size of dessert dishes, we ate our lunch in a small dining room. Lunch was waitressed by the students. Student members of The Vocational Industrial Clubs of America chapter at OST presented their award winning ceremony, which consisted of explaining the philosophy and goals of VICA. It was at lunch that Wayne introduced Dr. Robert D. Kamm, President of the Oklahoma State University. Kamm was able to present an overview of where OST fits into post secondary education in Oklahoma.

Another service we spent some time viewing was the auto mechanics section. This department included auto repair, body shops and parts supply. Any student or staff member could bring their car in to be repaired. The garages were very much like any big auto-garage operation only much cleaner and perhaps better staffed. The students worked their way from simple repair like tune-up to complex engine overhauls including the rebuilding of badly wrecked vehicles. It is also mandatory for the majors in automotive to spend a trimester in the automotive parts department in which students gain experience in an on-campus parts store. In this store they must learn how to research catalogs for the correct part, to know what is the correct part and how to order necessary stock. OST also has a modern, air conditioned service station training center which gives on-the-job training experience to service station students. The students can also learn car upholstery and work from simple seat covers to installing vinyl tops.

Equipment

OST prides itself on using up to date equipment in all their departments. The range of "hands on" experience opportunities for all students was indeed unique. Machinists can train on the latest numerical control machining tools. The students key punch their own program to produce an instructional tape for numerical control use on various machines. We saw the numerical control used on the automated milling machine in the deisel department. Students can learn skills on virtually the entire range of models available today. This type of equipment availability was duplicated in almost all of the 51 courses of instruction.

Afternoon Discussion:
After we toured all the departments we were going to see that day, we were escorted through the dormitories. Half of us spoke to families living on campus and the other half saw the actual dorm facilities. Then we had an afternoon pow-wow with the school administrators. This took place in the newly renovated student lounge (which had been student renovated).

Wayne conducted a question and answer period between the school's staff and our group members. Some specific pieces of information that emerged from the session were:

--Curriculum is established by need and the resources available to build a good department.

--There are three main contributing forces in deciding what vocational areas to work in : 1)administrative decision 2)trend of the time establishing a need for such training 3)suggestion of industrial liaison.

--Wayne Miller is the contact with the State Advisory Council. This advisory committee may be composed of out of state people as far away as Detroit, usually the committee is composed of 11 people who meet with campus officials and visit with faculty and students, review curriculum and make suggestions for updating courses and equipment.

--OST has good union relations. Some of the faculty members of OST are ex-union officials.

--Job placement for the student is excellent. The automative students average about 10 job offers before completion of school. The general average of job offers for OST students is 3. (this was borne out by speaking to the graduating students--everyone I spoke to had a job waiting for him upon graduation)

--A problem with the enrollment may be in the inability of the students to transfer their OST credits to another school. In effect they lose their credits obtained at OST if they want to continue their education at a four year degree granting college after completing OST.

--The cost of training at OST is assimilated by a down the middle split between the students and the state regional office of higher education. (50 percent-50 percent)

--The dropout rate is 40 percent of the total population, this includes transfer students and those who get jobs and leave school before completing their course requirements. The rate is 32 percent if adjusted to the students who get jobs.

One of Wayne's major concerns was the issue of credit transfer. It seems there is no established system of transferring credits. Legally the credits obtained at OST are not transferable and the students are well aware of this situation before entering the programs. The curriculum for many of the courses (examples: accounting and general education courses) are identical to those given at the State University at Stillwater. Therefore it seems a bit unfair that students of OST are not allowed to transfer credit from OST to Stillwater or any other state college. Dean Miller did point out that there have been cases where specific students have received credit for courses taken at OST when they have applied to a four year school. But this is the exception not the rule and there is no procedure established for this. As he put it, "these were done sort of under the table," --concern was expressed by some ESS participants that OST might be hurt by its own success i.e., that it might expand into too many areas to provide high quality training in all. The question of the limits of comprehensive growth was left unresolved.

At the end of this session Wayne presented each of us with a travel bag filled with two loaves of nutbread, a meat tenderizer, a desk organizer and literature on OST including a survey which was conducted on each department of OST. The data collected in this survey was part of a special oriented student research program executed by the University of Maryland under the direction of Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt (one of our group members). Each product was student designed and made and bore the OST logo "educating hand and mind."

Time to go--we were off--shuttled back to the motel we had one hour to shower and dress for dinner. In the evening we met state officials and saw the vocational rehabilitation facilities.

Around 6:30 our friends from the Okmulgee Chamber of Commerce picked us up and we were driven to the country club for cocktails before dinner. Dinner was of course at OST. This time it was a sit down dinner in the Red Door dinning room on campus. Again it was deliciously prepared by the students. It was a relaxing break to sit and enjoy a fine dinner with our hosts from OST, Okmulgee and the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. The evening had just begun. After dinner we met with members of the curriculum and Instructional Materials Center headed by Ronald Meek. The primary function of the center is to develop curriculum materials for use in vocational and technical education programs in Oklahoma. These materials include learning packages called units of instruction. Each unit includes educational objectives, information sheets, assignment sheets, job sheets, transparency masters and criterion measures. These packages were available for our inspection. They are heavily oriented to performance objectives.

In addition we were also given a look at the work Oklahoma's system of area vocational and technical education centers and the relationship of cooperation of the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education with industry to Oklahoma. The Oklahoma Employment Security Commission and Manpower Development and Training Division of the Vocational and Technical Education Department are partners in recruiting, directing, training and placement of unemployed and underemployed citizens of Oklahoma as trainees in skill centers and other areas located throughout the state. There seemed to be a silent uneasiness in our group about some of these programs; the question was raised that there seems to be a fine line between bringing industry into Oklahoma to boost the economy of Oklahoma and bringing industry in to help train the unemployed and underemployed. Was the State Vocational and Technical Education Department really using their trainees as commodities to lure big business into Oklahoma by swallowing a sizeable chunk of the training expenses for these industries? Or was the department's first priority really to train and educate the unemployed and underemployed. This is a question which warrants some serious examination and evaluation of goals on the part of the State Department of Vocational and Tecnical Education.

Our final segment of the program for Thursday was a tour of the vocational rehabilitation center at OST. Handicapped students are accepted at OST and the rehab center and staff helps them assimilate into the student role there. This department also serves as a thorough testing arena for those students who are not doing well in their present major or for those who have not yet chosen a major area of concentration. The students may undergo up to a week of testing in mechanical and mental aptitudes to help them find an area in which they may find success. The center is heavily utilized by returning veterans.

This was our final tour at OST, by now it was going on 11:00 p.m., we were pooped. The day had been a long one but very worthwhile.

Friday morning we were up bright and early. At 8:00 we left for the Tulsa Area Vocational Technical Center. Dr. Joe Lemley, principal of the Tulsa Area Vocational and Technical School met with us as a group. He discussed the problems of running an area school. Money came up as the public enemy No. 1. Both he and Wayne stressed the need for more money in order to meet the needs of the student and to keep in step with the changes in industry so that the students would be trained on modern equipment and graduate with marketable skills. Our co-hostess was Mary Schneider. The group divided and a portion of us went with Mary and toured the high school sector. The second group toured the post secondary facilities.

The students enrolled in the high school were representative of area academic high schools. They attend the area vocational school for half a day each day (Some in the mornings and others in the afternoon) This gives the students th opportunity to mix with nonvocational students in the respective high schools while giving them a chance to get quality vocational training courses. The school is eight years old and has only a 4 percent dropout rate compared to the nationwide figure of 30 percent for area vocational schools. Approximate 500 students a year finish high school training at this Tulsa school. The job placement of these students from 1966-1972 has been between 88-90 percent placement. The area school's equipment was much more limited than OST.

Our tour of the school was rushed and not nearly as complete as that of OST because of time limitations. But the time was sufficient for another questio to enter our minds about this type of school and how it fits into the vocatio al education scheme. The question concerns the post secondary facility on thi campus, it seems that a competition would exist between area vocational schoo offering a post secondary training program and those vocational post secondar schools like OST. Does it make sense to have these area post secondary schoo when more places like OST could be geographically spaced throughout the state It seemed that OST was so much better equipped and had acquired such a good reputation that it was duplicative to have another post secondary school with in an hour's drive of OST. The rationale given us was that one (the area school) was more remediative in outlook and tended to be less expensive. What has to be kept in mind is that the tour of the Tulsa school was short and overshadowed by the previous day's activities at OST. Yet it is important that some logical criterion be set up for funding and building post secondary facilities. The reality of limited funding requires that efforts be channeled to the most productive and reasonable source which will most benefit the student.

There was simply not enough time to assimilate what we had seen in the day and half we had spent in Oklahoma. I wish we had more time to talk to the students, sit in the classes and exchange ideas among ourselves.

The concept of the residential vocational school seems to be working at OST. The student centered environment at OST was refreshing.

--Reported by Angela Giordino
(22 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"ISSUES IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

DR. KENNETH B. HOYT
Director of Specialty Oriented Student Research Program
School of Education, University of Maryland

"The Key Role of Guidance and Counseling in Vocational and Manpower Programs"
Monday, October 9, 1972

Two Reports:

"Montgomery Emphasizes Vocation Aid" was a headline in the Washington Post on October 11, 1972, two days after an Education Staff Seminar with Dr. Kenneth Hoyt. The story said:

"Montgomery County high schools, traditionally geared toward preparing students for college, will now have guidance counselors to help the more than one-fourth of their graduates who do not want a college degree. "The County school board decided ... that at least one counselor in each of its 21 senior high schools will be designated a specialist in vocational education and job placement to advise noncollege-bound students..."

(The influence of Dr. Hoyt's work must have been felt in Montgomery where 72.5 percent of the graduating seniors go on to higher education!)

Although the basic issues raised at the Seminar by Dr. Hoyt and the attendees pointed toward the expanding need for guidance and counseling in manpower programs, the overall impact of such support systems are reflected in the public schools as well. In Dr. Hoyt's definition of such services, guidance and counseling can "implement professional direction of the individual; enhance freedom of choice and the individual's worth and dignity; permit an individual to lead his or her own destiny and make reasoned career choices."

This definition meets the objective of public school counseling in all its many varieties. It comes out of some forty years of Federal legislation which gave rise to and strengthened the struggling field of counseling and guidance. In 1938, the Deane Act increased the number of counselors in the public schools. In 1946, the Barden Act credentialed counselors by establishing the training of such personnel at the graduate level. The subsequent growth and development of social welfare legislation was accompanied by subsidized counseling activities.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

NDEA gave the profession an enormous boost by providing institutes which would enable counselors to receive professional training toward counseling the "intellectually able students to college." However, such an approach neglected those young people who were never going to college. This gap was recognized and closed by the plethora of manpower programs beginning in 1962 - and in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Thus, the limited vocational guidance available for many decades has now grown into a recognized, authoritative profession, represented by the American Personnel and Guidance Association, with a wide diversity of interests.

Having set this broad framework for discussion, Dr. Hoyt then presented his viewpoints in research in the field; data as evidence of success and recommendations for new Federal action. The problems in research and information gathering lie in the fact that counseling and guidance cover such a wide variety of needs: Vocational counseling, drug abuse, alcoholism, handicapped, veterans, etc. Dr. Hoyt believes that statistical differences cannot always provide the answers to the success of a program "since counseling and guidance depend ultimately on the role of the individual." "The individual makes the decision. How can anyone judge the worth of that decision and can it be judged by what happens to the individual after the decision is made? The intrinsic difficulties in quantitative analysis make any kind of a determination of effectiveness extremely perilous." Dr. Hoyt pointed out that there is "some evidence that says kids do better in school .... They stay in school and complete their program. But the Iowa Dropout Study also shows evidence to the contrary." It follows, therefore, that while a sense of achievement may be felt, the achievement itself is difficult to measure.

Founded with Federal dollars, and supported from infancy to maturation through Federal legislation, guidance and counseling depend upon continued and forceful Federal support. Changes in Federal priorities could stifle the growth of these services, impairing their effectiveness. With certain changes predicted in categorical funding, the whole range of support services could easily founder.

Dr. Hoyt had several recommendations for Congressional action. He is firmly committed to standardization of guidelines, development of common functions or duties, and standardization of credentialing. He claims that "without an umbrella coordination of all the guidance and counseling legislation" their future is that of endangered species. He would like to see strong support coming from the localities participating in revenue sharing for continued services. And he favors strongly the development of sound practices which would cover salary, nomenclature, terminology, classification, credentials, etc., which would give counseling and guidance a firmer footing in the professions.

Concluding the Seminar, Dr. Hoyt stipulated that above all Congress should require that follow-up studies be maintained which would provide accurate placement information and data from which new program determinations could be made and from which success patterns could be drawn.

--reported by Miriam Charnow

Without counseling, career education is "brain-washing", that is, teaching the students that certain jobs are "better" than others. "The student has a right to make his own decision."

Counselors today are taught how to make assessments of kids. "They need to be taught that non-college is not second-best." "They need to be taught to relate, to listen, to hear." Parents also need counseling. Students will go to a counselor to talk about career choices; they tend not to go to get other kinds of guidance. The counselor should be "the kids' advocate" in the school. Therefore, it is important that at least some counselors be school-based. (One listener commented that a counselor can make changes in a school if he has "some personal leverage", "influence with the principal." Hoyt feels that any counselor can have impact; he disagrees with the complaint of some counselors--especially those in big cities--that "the system" prevents their being effective.) Hoyt and several ESS members feel strongly that the school should take the responsibility for job placement. Some feel that proof of follow-up by counselors of high school graduates should be required; this would have tremendous impact on high school education, felt one participant.

Hoyt, and others present, think that some counseling should be done in non-school settings. Hoyt objects to having all counseling outside of the school building and school system, because counselors should stay in the school and "help to make it better". Someone commented that New York City has abolished all counselors, with disastrous results.

Re-training for career counseling: Hoyt feels that two-year graduate training is unnecessary and said that tests show this to be true. Several participants stressed the importance of having some career counseling done by persons outside the school system: by people from business and industry; by people who live in the school's community. Hoyt suggests that counselors get out into the community, perhaps swapping places with outsiders who would come in to do counseling. Several persons voiced opposition to requirements that counselors must first be teachers. Hoyt: counseling is "undersupplied with non-professionals". One commentator suggested giving "twenty lessons to non-college types" and then making them counselors; "bringing in people who aren't like teachers"; giving "a different orientation to reality". Hoyt said that one of the most effective career counselors in Baltimore had been a factory foreman for forty years. Pittsburgh has people from industry as counselors in the schools. Florida's regulations permit half of the counselors to be "occupational specialists" (from outside the school system). Team counseling, using teachers along with counselors, can be effective; it is in MDTA, and in some general high schools as well. One participant said that counseling can be done by teachers if you instruct them via modules. Hoyt agrees but sees danger in this because the teacher "is in an authoritative position" vis-a-vis the student; the counselor is (ideally) the kid's friend. Orange County, Calif., puts counselors under performance contracts, with each counselor writing his own contract (within broad guidelines) with his students.

Dr. Hoyt believes that Job Corps and VA have poor counseling. The MDTA Skill Centers, especially in Philadelphia, E. Los Angeles, Watts, and Detroit have effective career counseling, most of it done by paraprofessionals.

Dr. Hoyt: More students are going to private vocational schools than to vocational programs of community colleges. His surveys show that these kids have very specific (and anti-liberal arts) motivations: What subjects must I take? Why? Will that subject train me for a job? What job? How long will the training take? How much will the job pay? Many of these kids start out at community colleges but then "drop out" for the specialty-oriented programs. Kids usually ask career advice from other kids who are in the same situation as themselves or are in the kind of situation they are aiming for.

--reported by Petie Bailey
(attendance: 26 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

"SKILL CENTERS AND THEIR LESSONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION"

Dr. Rupert Evans
Professor of Vocational and Technical Education,
Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Wednesday, November 15, 1972

The name Skill Center, is being used by several groups-- the EDA, the Area Vocational Schools and the MDTA Skill Centers with which the name originated. Dr. Evans spoke about the latter group of centers, supported by MDTA funds from the Department of Labor and administered by HEW.

General Description of Skill Centers. There are approximately 80 Centers typically having about 200 trainees, serving an almost entirely disadvantaged population. Trainees receive counseling services, some placement assistance, and basic education that is tied very closely to the principal component of the program, which is occupational training.

Skill Centers are administered by a variety of groups and institutions-- community colleges, school districts, private non-profit organizations, etc. All the Centers operate on an annual basis, which creates a rather tenuous funding situation. Sometimes the delay in funding seems to be deliberate on Washington's part, in order to allow the Skill Centers' administrators an opportunity to get rid of dead wood on the faculty. Center staff may resign to take other jobs if there is a funding gap. However, this questionable technique can backfire if the "good" faculty resign and the ones who are not performing remain during a period when no salaries are being paid.

Skill Centers housing varies from new structures built especially for the Center to a condemned public school building in one city. Although training is apparently not affected by the condition of the facility, some prospective employers seem to think that a program operated in a dilapidated building must be inferior.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Students are usually segregated both socioeconomically as well as by sex. At the time the program was conceived, as was the case with handicapped children, segregation seemed a reasonable strategy that would make it more possible to meet the specific needs of "disadvantaged" trainees. Now we know that handicapped students learn much more when for at least a portion of their program they are integrated into environments with a "normal" student population. The same seems to be true of disadvantaged trainees when placed in settings with more "advantaged" students.

Male and female trainees are also segregated from each other, but by occupational choice, rather than by design. The women more often end up in health and clerical courses and the men choose metal processing, and mechanics, for example. The Skill Centers are funded for a specific number of slots--usually around 200. If a trainee drops out before completing his program, the Employment Service sends another person to the Center to fill that particular slot. There is no occupational choice in such a case. Federal officials view vacant slots as undesirable, for they believe the program should be kept operating with the maximum number of students. However, having several vacancies may give a trainee who enters after the program has begun more than one occupational area from which to make a choice.

Most courses are completed in less than one year, with the average lasting 29 weeks. The legislation allows for two-year programs, but few are that long. Center administrators play the "numbers game" and try to get as many trainees through their programs as possible in order to justify their continued existence to Washington. The short term course is not always to the program's advantage. Studies have shown that the longer the program, the better the return for the student in terms of salary, length of employment, etc.

Unions often have veto power over the training programs undertaken by the Centers, prohibiting some centers from training students for printing and construction trades, for example. Slots in the training programs are designated according to Employment Service job orders. However, this procedure is questionable because ES covers only a small percentage of jobs in the total labor market. There is apparently no serious attempt to forecast future job needs and gear training programs to reflect them. There is a forecasting unit in ES, but its data does not have much influence on Skill Center program design.

Most employers have no knowledge of the Skill Centers' existence. Others who have heard of the training programs consider them a waste of money. However, ratings of Skill Center graduates by their employers are very high.

Trainee Characteristics: There are three phrases that describe typical groups of trainees. (Although outright generalizations, Dr. Evans passed these on.):

"If they couldn't get there they did." This refers to the transportation problems faced by some Skill Center students. In many locations inadequate transportation facilities make it difficult for trainees to get to the Center. The students who manage to get to class are, as a result, those who are more highly motivated to attend than others. Through a self-selection process, the students who "get there" in spite of difficulties are above average.

"If they dropped out they got jobs." This group of students rather than being drop-outs are early completers who attend regularly, learn fast, and leave the Centers because they have found jobs.

"If they didn't attend, they graduated." Some of those students who attended sporadically were more interested in the training allowance than the training and came only often enough to remain in the program in order to continue receiving benefits. These trainees often made it to graduation.

Skill Centers and Vocational Education. The main link between Centers and vocational education programs is in communities where Skill Centers pick up the drop-outs from vocational education programs (sometimes without training stipends at first). Another relationship can be found in the functioning of the Centers as ersatz teacher training sites. Many Skill Center graduates wind up in jobs in vocational education programs. They have excellent abilities for working with students who are "disadvantaged" as they once were.

A new trend in Center program development is the open entry-open exit system where by a student can come into the program at any time during the course and can leave when he has accomplished his training objectives. In some Centers, credentials are being awarded to such early completers.

Recommendations for Change.

1. Reduce the socio-economic segregeation in both Skill Centers and vocational education programs by creating closer ties to educational institutions that serve a broader range of adults.
2. Establish more union-operated MDTA programs, and fewer management linked programs. In many areas, unions control more jobs. This would make it easier to funnel trainees into jobs.
3. Redefine "disadvantaged" in vocational education legislation. The law defines a disadvantaged person as one who cannot succeed in a regular vocational education course.
4. Stop regarding "creaming" as a capital offense. Creaming is the selection of students for the program who are not the most difficult to train. More persons who are highly motivated and have a higher potential for learning should be included.

5. Establish longer courses. Training should include courses for LPN's and registered nurses, etc. Such courses require a longer training period in order to obtain credentials.
6. Institute cooperative programs with employers so that students can work on the job part-time while they are in training. This seems to work particularly well in medium-sized cities that are in a fairly, good economic situation.
7. Develop special programs for women with low verbal abilities. Creaming is practiced in selection among females who enter LPN and clerical courses. This ignores the women who have the poorest language and reading skills.

Questions.
1. Dr. Evans advocates longer training programs to allow for courses of study in occupations that require them, and does not see anything incompatible between the longer program and granting of credentials to "early completers"--those who master the occupational area before the full course is over.
2. Skill Center graduates can come back to the Center for training in another occupational area. This is not encouraged, however. There is no up-grading program for graduates.
3. There are no data on the ethnic proportions among the various occupational areas. Vocational education studies show, however, that in terms of background, their students reflect the ethnic ratios of the general population.
4. The community college population, according to a recent study, is made up primarily of 1)low-income students who are relatively high achievers, and 2) higher-income students who are low achievers. It would be interesting to see what proportion of each of these groups is represented among the vocational education school population.
5. The technology of occupational projections is developing, but in local Employment Service units, research and statistics in this area are far from adequate. Nowhere is there any accounting for the effect of such variables as war vs. peace, public service employment programs that begin and end, etc.
6. There is a widespread opinion, particularly among employers, that manpower programs just don't work. Employer satisfaction with graduates of such programs has not been convincingly documented. This should be done and these documents disseminated for maximum impact on federal agencies and potential employers.
7. There were those persons who said, when they perceived an apparent failure among manpower programs, "Let's turn it over to the businessmen--they'll solve all our problems." When the JOBS program failed those same persons said the problems are insoluble.
8. Career education is viewed in a very positive way by elementary school teachers. They are beginning to look at the entire spectrum of jobs and their relative importance to society and the status they bring to the individual.

9. Manpower programs do have an effect on unemployment. Without manpower programs, the unemployment rate would be closer to 6.5 percent than its current level of 5.6 percent. These programs also contribute to the decline in unemployment among Vietnam veterans. More than 40,000 vets are now in jobs as a result of manpower programs.
10. If comprehensive manpower legislation is passed by Congress, the Skill Centers would fare very well, if there are locally determined priorities. Those Centers that have community advisory committees, and that do not depend solely on Employment Service job orders for defining job needs will do well.
11. The GAO report on vocational education stated: If vocational education was doing a better job of training, it would eliminate some of the need for 29-week Skill Center training programs.
12. Dr. Evans would redefine "disadvantaged" to mean those who need special assistance beyond that provided by vocational education. HEW would concur in this change, he said.

--reported by Patsy Fleming
(25 participants)

PART VI

VIEWPOINTS: ON THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL LEARNING NEEDS

School systems are increasingly called to task for not providing effective educational services for students with physical and mental handicaps, as well as for those who come from culturally disadvantaged backgrounds. Two recent examples of this new concern are the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children decision (which requires local educational agencies-school districts-to provide public education for handicapped children) and the relatively new Federal program of aid for children from non-English speaking backgrounds. Federal commitment to helping "disadvantaged" children expanded with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (especially through Title I) but has a history dating back to the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1935 (which provides educational aid to native American children).

As these Federal programs and the national concerns underlying them have expanded, a growing number of researchers have questioned the strategies used to generate results for these children. ESS programs center on this questioning and discuss the types of research being done and its recommendations of alternative strategies for helping students with special learning needs.....

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:
INCLUDES DIRECT REMARKS BY DR. COLEMAN AS WELL AS ONE PARTICIPANT'S NOTES*

DR. JAMES S. COLEMAN
Professor, Department of Social Relations
The Johns Hopkins University
Monday, May 15, 1972

Recent events have focused attention on equal educational opportunity, especially the use of busing to further school integration. In this emotionally charged environment, the report, Equality of Educational Opportunity, published in 1966, still stands as the seminal research on this subject. Coleman's primary thesis for the evening was the interpretations and uses appropriate for the document.

Coleman began by tracing the major milestones in the equal educational opportunity issue: briefly, the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title IV of the former provided for the withholding of federal funds from school districts for noncompliance; Title I of the latter supplied the funds to be withheld. Since 1965 what has occurred, under pressure from the courts, has been the adoption of increasingly stringent criteria for defining desegregation and equal educational opportunity. Whereas in 1955 it was enough to eliminate the dual school system, courts have recently required busing to balance the racial mix throughout schools in a district and have forced states to change school district boundaries to improve racial mix. As the equality criteria became more difficult to meet, what was originally a southern problem--the elimination of the dual school systems--spread to the North in the form of questions concerning racial isolation. It was argued (Coleman pointed out that the NAACP Legal Defense Fund was the major agent) that if criteria for racial mix influenced education in the South, they must be equally applicable in the North. This momentum led to an "escalating conflict" and the present turn of events.

> (Coleman: "I attribute the "escalation," the increasingly stringent criteria imposed by the courts, to the fact that many southern districts found ways of escaping desegregation by various devices. The courts found that the only way they could insure that these districts did comply was by imposing criteria that specified something about the proportions of black and white children in schools.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

> "The movement to the North resulted from the recognition that if these criteria were applicable in the South, then many northern communities had also taken actions to further segregation, and were subject to these criteria. (The Detroit case was argued by a southern black lawyer, who had previously argued southern desegregation suits, and was merely applying the same criteria in the North as had been successfully applied in the South, and using the same arguments he had used there.) There were two separable goals: equal educational opportunity and creation of an integrated society. Although the courts' decisions were based upon provision of educational opportunity, the "hidden agenda" was often the creation of an integrated society.
>
> "My point was that the courts are an appropriate instrument for protecting rights, that is, for preventing evils, but not the appropriate instrument for bringing about desired ends, that is, for creating positive social good. It was in the absence of legislative and executive action directed toward integrating the society that the court began to adopt this second goal, which I described as a hidden agenda.")

The "Coleman Report" provided two findings used by the courts: (1) Few things about the usual measures of school equality showed any relation to school achievement. (2) Of those which did, the mix of students in schools was significant. But the impact of this mix was not enough to produce equality of educational achievement. Nevertheless, these findings became increasingly significant to the courts as they shifted towards the issue of what constitutes equal educational opportunity. The courts accepted the argument, based on this evidence, that equal distribution of educational resources--inputs to the schools--did not constitute equal educational opportunity unless students were equally distributed, i.e., racially balanced.

> (Coleman: "The Coleman Report should not be used, in my opinion, as a primary evidence for the argument that equal educational opportunity is not provided unless schools are racially balanced. The evidence shows that educational opportunity for lower-class children is enhanced by being in schools with middle-class children, but not that it is a necessary and sufficient condition for equality of educational opportunity. The fallacy of this approach can be seen by supposing that the results had come out opposite: following the same logic, one would say that equal educational opportunity can only be provided by racial isolation.
>
> "My point is and was that the achievement benefits of integrated schools for lower-class children show that all other things equal, integrated schools are better, and constitutes evidence for attempting to achieve integration without otherwise reducing the benefits of schools, but not evidence that integration alone is the criterion for equal educational opportunity. I happen to believe that equal educational opportunity is enormously easier to achieve in integrated schools, and that the federal government has been derelict in not facilitating through direct use of funds the integration of schools throughout the country.

> "Incidentally, a court decision that I see as correct is the recent Minneapolis one. It found a number of actions of the school system that had increased racial segregation (in location of new schools, in having some schools especially small and others especially large, in underutilizing some schools and overusing others), and directed the school board to take actions that would undo the segregating effect of these decisions, and would maximize the amount of integration that could be created by normal districting of schools. It did not, however, require the school board to undo the segregating effect of housing patterns that had developed in the city.")

Coleman traced the rise and influence of the common school in America. Since 1946, however, increased affluence has meant some groups could escape to suburbs where the public schools no longer serve all the people. The effect is to separate groups by economic and social levels. The question now becomes how can public education counteract this influence? How can the schools provide common educational attributes sufficient to maintain the concept of the common school? Coleman sees one effect of present court decisions as making it more difficult for parents to create private enclaves. But the need remains to recreate the common schools or find satisfactory replacements.

> (Coleman: "Increasing private affluence and mobility allows middle-class persons to increasingly segregate themselves, thus destroying the classical "common school" characteristic of America. This is a problem that will not be solved by court decisions nor by simple-minded legislation, but one which must be addressed if the socially integrating forces once provided by the common school are to be retained or reinstituted, either through the school or otherwise.")

Questions: The following summarize the questions and significant aspects of the responses:

Question: Does the same influence of racial mix, i.e., the conclusion of significant difference exist at the college level?

Coleman: It makes sense that it would follow, but there is no research to substantiate the claim (c.f., the Astin studies: college output is directly related to input. The better the entering freshman, the better the graduates).

Question: If the studies show some beneficial impact, shouldn't we continue to go where the courts are leading us? Can we construct public policy to test other assumptions which are also going where we are going? Is it giving up too fast to bow to the busing hysteria and look elsewhere?

Coleman: He did not imply "giving up;" rather, it is necessary to sort out the agenda of the "integrated society" and "equal protection." It is extremely unfortunate Nixon made the school busing statement on television, because it provided hope that persons would not have to make the system work.

If there is either too much push to busing or too radical court decisions (e.g., Richmond, Detroit), much damage will be done. One must recognize a certain rate of change which will be digestible at a period of time. It is important to maintain this change, not to create explosive issues which are going to bring a reversion to an earlier time.

Coleman stated his agreement with the policy implicit in the Richmond and Detroit decisions, namely, to force the states to take back responsibility for recognizing that school boundaries are arbitrary. This indicates a positive direction, but the results will be a long time coming. We need agreement now on the rate of change (not the direction), especially in an election year.

In response to another question, Coleman stated his support of the Ribicoff amendment but pointed out that it would be difficult to administer. He pointed to the lack of action by the executive and legislative which has caused the courts to act.

The long-term consequence of the Report seems to be that it casts doubt on current wisdom about what improves schools. His hunch is that to improve schools, the pattern of employment (and hiring policies) of the society must change.

Question: Is the compensatory education figure of $300 reasonable?

Coleman: The Administration research is fragmentary. Nothing supports this position. He suggests giving the $300 to families to deal with a specific educational problem, for instance, reading.

In response to several questions Coleman emphasized his support of summer studies but not in the usual classrooms. He favors camps, etc. This study would help reduce summer "learning loss" which is greater for disadvantaged children than for middle class youngsters.

Coleman related his present projects which are not research but a broad outlining of issues and problems around the question of "How do the young become adults?" A panel meets to discuss and study issues and alternatives. A report will be published.

Discussing the schools of the future, Coleman noted that in an "information rich" society the schools must provide not information but opportunities for experience -- using information. He sees two alternative directions for future schooling: (1) improve the mix of kids and adults (more adults than presently in schools and as learners), or (2) create more self-contained communities among kids (auto-socialization). Neither of these conditions now exists, and this is a major problem.

--reported by Walt Le Baron
(attendance: 36 persons)

ESS EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
2000 L STREET, N.W., ROOM 610 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 • (202) 293-3166
A Project of The George Washington University

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
DAY CARE SITE VISITS
CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, INC.
1020 Third Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001
May 7, 1971

The Child Day Care Association, a nonfinancially supported member of the Health and Welfare Council of the Greater Washington Area, was incorporated in July 1964 as a private, nonprofit agency dedicated to:

> The continuation and growth of good day care facilities for children through necessary community action and legislation.
>
> The education of the public to an awareness and understanding of good day care.
>
> Establishing and operating day care centers in the areas of greatest need.
>
> Working with official agencies toward achieving highest standards of care for all pre-school children in the National Capital Area; and acting as a consultant to other day care organizations and to groups planning the establishment of such centers.

The first center was opened in September 1965, when the Association became the recipient of Head Start funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity as a delegate agency of the United Planning Organization.

The group assembled at the Child Day Care Association office at 9:15 am for the bus tour. Mrs. Virginia Street, Education Director, Mrs. Helen Taylor, Model Cities Project Director, and Mrs. Fran Swift, Public Relations Director for the Association, acted as our guides.

First Visit: Hayes School Day Care Center (Operated under the Model Cities Program)
5th and K Streets, N. E.
Mrs. Enid Greenridge, Director

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

The Association utilizes the first floor of this no longer used public school building. We visited classrooms of three-year-olds, four-year-olds, and five- and six-year-olds where we found many kinds of creative activity in progress, including painting, block building, puzzle completing, group singing, and picture book discussion. As this is an aide training center, the pupil/teacher ratio was excellent with each class having one teacher, one teaching assistant and two aides for classes of approximately 15 children.

In order to enroll in the day care program, the child must live in the neighborhood and the family's income must be within the guidelines for low-income families, although 10% of the children at each center may come from homes where the income is slightly higher.

Second Visit: Labor Department Demonstration Day Care Center
Auditors' Building, 14th and Independence Ave., S.W.
Miss Mattie Jackson, Director

This center is considered a model for employer-run, on-the-jobsite day care. Fees are charged on a sliding scale according to income. Another demonstration aspect of this center is that it accepts very young children (18 months). On acceptance of a child this young, however, involvement with the parent is mandatory--input and communications between parent or parents and the center is essential in order to insure the well-being of the child.

A question was raised regarding the feasibility of having the children travel to and from day care centers and it was the opinion of those representing the Association that community-based day care is best, but when it is not available, then commuting is necessary.

Parent involvement at this center is excellent and may possibly be due to the proximity of the center to the place of employment, i.e., parents can easily visit the center for conferences regarding their children.

After this visit, the group returned to the Day Care Association office where Mr. Thomas C. Taylor, Executive Director, briefly described the history of the Association and the need for more centers. The first day care center opened in September 1965--this week the 19th center opened--and by July 1, 24 centers with a capacity for 2500 children will be operating. The need, however, just to serve low-income children, is for 15,000 places.

Although Washington has 160 private, for-profit or church-based day care centers, these often leave much to be desired. Good day care costs approximately $2200 per child per year (this is the Association's cost figure) and some of these organizations say they can do it for $800 per child per year. This means skimping on meals, poor teacher/pupil ratios, and little, if any, equipment, books, creative playthings, etc.

Mr. Taylor advised the group of the difficulty in finding sites for centers. Old buildings quite often cannot meet various regulations and in middle-income areas where there are new buildings, the cost is too high. Even when using old public school buildings, the Association must pay the D. C. government maintenance costs.

Mr. Taylor introduced resource personnel of the Association and each briefly described her function.

Dr. Alberta Valles, Child Psychiatrist

Responsibilities include conferences with staff about children and their problems, helping staff to understand parents, helping staff relate to staff, playroom diagnostics and conferences with parents. Dr. Valles also conducts a group session with "after school" care children which includes the eight most disruptive/disturbed children in the program.

When necessary, Dr. Valles enlists the assistance of the Hillcrest Children's Center, Areas B or C Community Mental Health Centers, or the Christ Child Society. A therapeutic nursery is being operated by the Association where those children too disturbed or disruptive for regular day care groups can better be cared for.

Sister Geraldine O'Brien, Parent Activities Coordinator

Each center has a parent group and this parent group selects the staff at the center. From each center parent group, two are selected as representatives on the Parent Policy Committee of the Association. This Committee selects the OEO Policy Director.

Getting parents involved has not been an easy task, but efforts are paying off now. The staff played an extremely important part in getting parents interested and involved.

Margaret Harris, Director, Social Services

The function of the Social Services Director is to help mothers understand and live with their problems (three-fourths of all of the children come from families without a father in the home). A large part of this work is letting parents "unload" problems.

Ada Henry, Director, Health Services

Prevention is the most important facet of the program. Immunizations for all children must be accomplished. All staff members must have examinations and x-rays once a year. We arrange, with the help of various agencies, for vision tests, hearing tests, and dental screenings. Because the city doesn't offer dental health services, it is necessary to use dentists on a contract basis. Perhaps, in the future, a mobile unit providing this kind of service will be available. Another aim of the program is teaching the children hygiene.

Dora Thomas, Nutritionist

The centers provide breakfast, lunch, and two snacks daily. We try to provide a variety of foods and enlist the children's aid in preparation of simple foods. We are projecting a program of nutrition education.

Virginia Street, Education Director

The Association is concerned with the development of the whole child, his physical and mental health, intellectual development, and special need for love and affection away from mom.

The early years are critical to foster intellectual development and in this regard, the Association stresses teacher/pupil one-to-one conversations, creative stimulus in the classrooms, encouragement, self-reliance, and development of feelings of self worth.

Helen Taylor, Project Director, Model Cities Program

Currently, the Association has 400 children enrolled under the Model Cities program. (The Hayes Day Care Center visited this morning is under this program.)

One extremely important facet of the program is the interest in Career Development being shown. A program of training staff members to get their GED is underway. Emphasis is on building career development into the program .

Audrey Gibson, Project Director, Head Start

Handling staff problems and, in general, keeping staff happy is my main concern. Stress is on the importance of teamwork.

There was discussion on various other approaches to the problem of providing day care. Some suggestions were:

1. Employ inner-city mothers for home day care.
2. Give the family the $2200 or so that day care costs and let them decide how to use it.
3. Employ youth corps children to help--using something like "Sesame Street" as a teaching aid.
4. Employ public school system children to run day care centers in basements of public school buildings.

In response to the fourth suggestion, Dr. Valles advised that vocational schools had been involved with the program previously, and this had worked very well, with some of the vocational students joining the staff after graduation. However, at the present time there is no coordinated effort between the Association and the public school system.

A question was raised as to whether the centers try to involve fathers. Dr. Valles stated that the centers generally work with one-parent families, usually the mother.

A suggestion was made that the Association use Vietnam veterans as teaching aides, thereby improving the involvement of these children with men. Dr. Valles thought this was an excellent idea and advised that the centers have four male teachers in the training program at present.

In response to a question regarding inservice training, the Association advised they provide:

1. Conferences with staff, conducted by Dr. Valles, stressing the importance of good "team" relationships.
2. Training of staff in Greensboro or New York City.
3. On-the-job training daily provided by the center directors.
4. Yearly evaluation of teachers by center director and Mrs. Street.

Mention was made of the Welfare Department's training program for mothers. In a study completed two years ago, it was ascertained that 50% of mothers who were in training upgraded their salaries by one to two thousand dollars annually.

The discussion session ended and the group boarded the bus for our third visit of the day.

Third Visit: Blair/Ludlow/Taylor After School Program
7th and G Streets, N.E.
Mr. Curtis Beck, Director

This program operates from 3 pm - 7 pm daily during the school year and from 7:30 am - 7 pm in the summer and is free to children of working parents grades 3 through 6. Program objectives are:

1. To supervise children after school.
2. To establish a warm adult/child relationship for children who do not get enough adult companionship.
3. To provide opportunities for new and constructive peer group relationships.
4. To provide a flexible enrichment program for neighborhood children in need of developmental stimulation.
5. To serve as a deterrent to juvenile delinquency.
6. To expand the use of the public school as a neighborhood center.

The program provides athletic activity, cultural arts and self-expression (art, dramatics, music, dance, etc.), black identity, games, broadened horizons through trips, etc. and intellectual activities (science, math, reading, homework, etc.). The children receive a well-balanced light meal daily. There are currently 90 children enrolled.

My overall impression is that the Association is staffed by dedicated, committed professionals who are performing admirably in an area where there is a great need. Hopefully, by increasing awareness of this need, more can be accomplished.

---reported by June Frank

(32 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
"THE EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS"
Wednesday evening, January 5, 1972

In preparation for the ESS mid-January field trip to the Santa Fe Pueblo area and the Navajo Indian Reservation, Mrs. Helen Scheirbeck and Mrs. Anita Pfeiffer spoke on various aspects concerning Indian education. Mrs. Scheirbeck, Director of the Office of American Indian Affairs at OE, provided a brief orientation on the American Indian and his relationship to the Federal Government giving particular emphasis to the history and development of Indian education practices and policies. Some of the highlights of her remarks included the following:

1. The American Indian population in the United States currently numbers over 800,000 and a substantial portion of this total population receives no special services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At present there are approximately 250 organized tribes with tribal governments and under the jurisdiction of the BIA. Most of these federally-connected Indians live in the trans-Mississippi West. However, many Indians also live in those States east of the Mississippi River, and most of these Eastern Indians are not under BIA jurisdiction. In addition, approximately 38 percent of the total American Indian population resides in urban areas throughout the nation.

2. Most organized tribes have a tribal council, an elected chairman or president, and a written constitution and bylaws. Many reservations also have a tribal legal and court system. Such tribal courts have jurisdiction over a number of offenses occurring on the reservation. For major offenses, however, trial is held in a Federal court. Off the reservation, State courts normally have jurisdiction for offenses committed by Indians. But for both Indians and non-Indians alike, determining jurisdiction is often a confusing matter.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

3. From its inception in the 1820's until the 1960's, the BIA was practically the sole Federal agency involved with Indian affairs, including education. But within the past decade, a variety of Federal agencies have become much more active in providing services for Indians. Of all these agencies, the Office of Economic Opportunity has perhaps been most instrumental in getting grant money to Indians so they may run their own programs.

4. The Office of Education has a responsibility to all Indian people; not just to those who live on or near a Federal reservation and receive special services through the BIA. In practice, this responsibility means that the Office of Education has the obligation to serve urban Indians, Indians on State reservations, and other non-federally connected Indians as well as Indians living on Federal reservations.

5. There is no uniform Indian opinion regarding education. Because of the various public and missionary educational practices that Indians have encountered over the course of the past century and a half (but particularly shipping Indian children off to distant boarding schools), many Indians have come to view education as an alien institution hostile to their traditions and culture. Today, there are still many Indians asking the question: What can education do? And only within the past five to ten years, with the advent of community control and participation, has education begun to be viewed as a positive asset to the Indian way of life.

6. Today, Indian children attend public, Federal, private and mission schools. Currently, over 68 percent of Indian elementary and secondary students attend public schools, about 25 percent attend Federal schools, and approximately 6 percent attend mission and other private schools.

7. To encourage the public schools to assume the education of Indian children, Congress in 1934 passed the Johnson-O'Malley Act to provide financial support for the public education of Indian children. As administered by the BIA, Johnson-O'Malley funds have only gone to public schools on or near Federal trust land. In addition, most public school districts receiving Johnson-O'Malley money have used it for general support purposes, not for special services for Indian children as intended. The last time the Johnson-O'Malley Act was amended was in 1936.

8. The funding of Indian education by OE has grown over the last 20 years to its present level of some $79 million. This is due in part to the inclusion of the BIA among eligible recipients of OE funds in many areas and the extension of P.L. 874. The increased involvement is also due to the high increase in Indian enrollment in public schools. But although OE has generated a lot more money in recent years, the quality of many programs appears questionable.

The guest speaker of the evening, Mrs. Anita Pfeffer, a Navajo and former principal of the Rough Rock Demonstration School currently participating in the Harvard Program for Educational Administrators, spoke about Navajo education and particularly about the Rough Rock Demonstration School and the Navajo Community College. Her remarks included the following points:

1. The Navajo Reservation is large, about three times the size of Massachusetts or about the size of West Virginia. The Reservation lacks sufficiency among many services including roads, phones, hospitals, restaurants, and motels. The Navajo people do not cluster in towns or villages, but rather live spread out across the Reservation. For a Navajo, a "community" is constituted by all who trade at one trading post. The Rough Rock community, for example, has a radius of about 16 miles.

2. The Rough Rock Demonstration School is a tribal school controlled and operated by the local Navajo community at Rough Rock, Arizona. This school, the first of its kind in the nation, began in July 1966 when the BIA agreed to turn over new boarding school facilities to the Navajo tribe. In September 1966 the first classes were held at Rough Rock.

3. The first years at Rough Rock were hectic and a learning experience for the staff and parents as well as the students. After the second year the first director, an Anglo, left and was replaced by a Navajo who could converse with the parents in their own tongue. One of the primary concerns of the Navajo parents was that when their children had gone away to the boarding schools where only English was spoken, they had come back home not really knowing English and having forgotten Navajo. These Navajo parents expressed a deep concern for the preservation of their language, culture and history and wished to pass this on to their children. And it was

this concern among other reasons that led the Rough Rock Demonstration School to fashion a bilingual-bicultural curriculum.

4. The bilingual curriculum at Rough Rock builds upon what the children already know when they start school by instructing in Navajo first and then English. By starting to read in books written in Navajo, the children also acquire a knowledge of the symbols and sounds that will be used to learn English. All the teaching staff at Rough Rock are required to learn Navajo and a number of the staff are members of the Navajo community who can relate to children, but would be considered uncertified in the public schools.

5. The school board of the Rough Rock Demonstration School is composed of seven board members, all of whom are Navajo. All school board meetings are conducted in the Navajo language.

6. As the parents of the students at Rough Rock found that they could discuss and understand their children's studies, many became interested in various subjects, such as English and mathematics, themselves. And this interest has resulted in adult education programs for these parents.

Q. Is the Indian concern for cultural retention only a recent phenomenon?

A. No, only rediscovered by non-Indians. But this time there is a concerted effort to transform education into a main tool for cultural preservation.

Q. What pressures are there at Rough Rock to get children to question their culture and its values?

A. The education process at Rough Rock encourages the children to think and ask questions, including those about their own culture. This has caused some problems in some homes, but the students and their parents have, in general, successfully resolved these problems.

Q. The Navajo are a numerous people. Will what has worked at Rough Rock work for other smaller tribes?

A. The educational approach and method should vary to meet the individual needs and existing circumstances of each tribe.

Q. What improvements should the Federal Government make in its Indian education policies?

A. In addition to more funds, encourage better quality programs and get more money into the hands of Indians so that they can develop and run their own educational programs.

Reported by Dave Osman
(attendance: 41 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*
"THE EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS"--AN EVALUATION OF THE FIELD TRIP
Wednesday, February 2, 1972

Today's recap of experiences and impressions of the Educational Staff Seminar visit to two Indian nations in New Mexico and Arizona, January 18-22, 1972, was marked by a high percentage of participation (66-2/3 per cent) and lively discussion. A substantial portion of the opening remarks related to sub-group visits to the various Pueblo schools. Following is some of the commentary on these visits.

Little effort seems to be expended by teachers to reinforce Pueblo language or culture or to provide bilingual education for those who spoke little or no English. In some of the Pueblo schools, English and Spanish were taught, but no Indian language. Another observer added that in the Pueblo she visited elders of the tribe were openly hostile to attempts to impart their traditions and language on a public scale. Generally, they felt that schools should teach "academics"; cultural instruction should be left to the home.

In contrast to the highly culture-oriented Navajos who, for the most part, are sheepherders, the Pueblos had had more exposure to American society (i.e. working on the Santa Fe railroad) and had become fairly well acculturated. The degree to which an Indian is exposed to American society, then, would largely determine the extent to which he would be able to "parrot" it. Hence, the assumption that the Pueblos were further down the cultural ladder than the Navajos, was not a viable conclusion.

In one of the Pueblos visited, this acculturation had created "tension" between the two cultures; Indians who had gone "establishment" felt uncomfortable in the American society. This evoked the comment that, for the most part, minority group members rarely, if ever, feel at ease in the majority culture.

Most of the Pueblos were more concerned with community control of the schools, particularly at the elementary level, than with dictating curriculum. Such control, opined another participant, would create bickering among the tribes--not to mention a reduction in BIA funds. There was a demonstrated need for both BIA and public schools, but it followed that the Pueblos would favor BIA schools since it was here they had the most clout. (The public schools are controlled by Chicanos with no Pueblo representation on the school board, a source of great discontent to many of the Pueblo officials with whom we spoke.) Although the number of Indians in a given school constituted a substantial percentage of the population (at least 20 percent in the schools visited), we did not see any Indian administrators, teachers or teacher aides. When public school officials were queried on this situation, most of them replied that they couldn't find any Indians to fill these posts--but quickly added they had no objection to hiring them.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

One participant put to the floor the question of whether the children were actually receiving a good basic education. To this came the response that we had seen some good teachers and classes, but simply had not seen enough to form a judgment. (As an aside, this reporter had occasion to observe one of our guides, a high school age youth, try to help an elementary school student solve a simple subtraction problem. He was unable to do so without the help of one of the members of our group.)

The conversation shifted to the use/misuse of Johnson-O'Malley funds. Generally, all of the participants felt that JOM funds were not being utilized properly by school officials for their Indian students. This was due primarily to improper segregation of funds by local and state education agencies. (One participant volunteered that he knew of an instance where BIA had actually given permission to officials in one state [with a high percentage of Indian students] to mix general and JOM funds!) One observer said this was neither a new nor a unique development; many States have for a long time practiced"tokenism" in their Indian education programs.

One participant stated that JOM could be paralleled to the Title I program; in too many instances, there exists inappropriate use of money for inappropriate people and purposes. JOM and Title I monies should be used to supplement rather than supplant a State's general revenue for special education programs.

The next point was what measures and strategies should be employed by the Federal Government to insure more effective implementation of the JOM and other Federal programs affecting the education of American Indians. Here are some of our group's comments:

. The President should direct BIA and the Department of the Interior to jointly revamp their guidelines. (The problem of "mixed jurisdiction" creates considerable difficulty in the effective administration of programs by SEAs and LEAs.) As of this writing, Interior is re-working its guidelines.

. The Office of Education or some Federal agency should assume authority for the pulling together and overall coordination of Indian programs and for developing legislation which would encompass the entire area of educational programs for American Indians. This was viewed as an impracticable approach by many of the participants who were quick to point out that there are some 250 tribes speaking 50 to 100 different languages throughout America.

. The Federal Government must continue to be positive toward Indian aspirations and increase its support of their "self-determination theory".

. The Federal Government must determine what its obligations are, then tailor resources toward the fulfillment of such goals.

. Improve and refocus current ad hoc efforts on behalf of Indian tribes.

In summary, each of the participants indicated that the trip had been of value and had created a keener awareness of and sympathy for the needs and aspirations of American Indians. The trip also had the added value of surfacing the need for better interagency coordination of efforts in their behalf. The meeting concluded with one participant's (from Interior Dept.) promise to circulate his agency's bill concerning the contracting out of Federal services to Indian tribes for their own management and determination with a request for comments and suggestions from participants in the field trip.

--Reported by Dietra Hall
(20 Participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

FIELD TRIP: THE AZTLAN (SOUTHWEST) CHICANO COMMUNITY, LOS ANGELES

April 12-14, 1972

NOTES OF A PARTICIPANT*

The tone of our trip to the Los Angeles Chicano community was set our first night. We arrived Wednesday afternoon at Los Angeles airport and were transported by bus through the endless streams of commuting traffic to the Holiday Inn in East Los Angeles. After a few moments to breathe, we reboarded our bus, and under the leadership of Frank Paz, Frank Alderete, Mary Mend, we went to Belvedere Junior High School. We ate our first Mexican dinner here, and then the meeting started. It was here that we began to learn.

The community was not exactly overjoyed at our presence. That first evening we heard from four very active community members, and then after they spoke, numbers of other local people talked openly. The four panel members, Leonard Valverti, Rose Lopez, Linda Benetes, and Ralph Ochoa afforded us our first insight into life in Chicano East Los Angeles. Rosa, perhaps more than anyone else, made us aware of our position there. She said what we were to hear over and over again during the next two days. What are you doing here? What are you going to do for us? Why does the Educational Staff Seminar pay to send you Washington bureaucrats to come and observe us when we should be sent to Washington to see you? Her point was well, if somewhat uncomfortably, taken. Rosa is a welfare mother who quickly and articulately made us aware of the hardships of life where there are so few opportunities. She stressed the failure of the educational system for Mexican American youth. This was a theme we were to hear, and to view, over and over again. Rosa spoke of the unresponsiveness of middle class, non-Spanish-speaking teachers. They don't understand, they don't care about the Chicano youths.

Ralph Ochoa, the speaker who followed Rosa, made this very clear, at least from the stand point of opportunities in higher education, when he pointed out that in 1969 he was the only Mexican American to graduate from an accredited law school in California. He went on to talk about the efforts that legislators have made to keep Chicanos out of the political system. East Los Angeles serves as a case in point. The area is almost completely Mexican American, and yet it has been gerrymandered so that it is divided among nine assembly districts. The Mexican American sentiments are thus effectively splintered.

Frank Valverdi was another speaker that evening who made us further aware of the problem in East Los Angeles, again particularly sensitive to the education problems. Like Rosa, he stressed that America is not faced with a minority problem. The minorities are not the problem. America is the problem. We, as representatives of the Washington bureaucracy, are the problem. Frank talked of the 50% drop out rate in Mexican American schools. Because the schools are not responsive to them, the Chicano youths are inevitably pushed out. Students within the system test very low in reading (mainly because of language difficulties) and sometimes they demonstrate discipline problems. The problems are of course cancerous: the kids test low, are therefore tracked low; school becomes a kind of foreign prison for them; and as a rejection of all that is wrong, the students often resort to violence. He spoke of all of this as the failure of the system to deal with the unique needs of the Chicano youths. Mr. Valverdi noted that for a long while the Mexican American community has stood by and quietly watched the failure of its youngsters. That time has passed. Now there is a new breed, particularly a new breed of youth. They are no longer trusting of the establishment; they are vocal and they want what they, as members of this country, have a right to have.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Linda Benetes, the last member of the panel, spoke very briefly. She made those of us who were from federal agencies more than a little uncomfortable. She spoke mainly of the frustrations of federally-funded programs: of the struggles to get them started, of the gradual achievement of success, of the battle for funding, and then finally of the frequent cessation of federal money. Here we saw what happens at the local level when the decision is made, in Washington, to cease a project because it is not"cost effective."

After the panel talks, we had one of the unique experiences of the trip. It served also as a time to digest some of what the community had been saying to us. A group of students from nearby Lincoln High School entertained us with their Mexican dances. It was fantastically joyous; the kids glowed with their pride and enthusiasm. The Anglos among us, who had been somewhat naive about the Mexican American, suddenly saw and understood the colorful life and wonderful spirit of the Chicano people. It was good.

After the dancing, the discussion generally opened up to the community members who were there. The people spoke openly and movingly about their problems and frustrations: of the recalcitrance of the Anglo community to do anything of the outright prejudice the Mexican Americans suffer in their every day lives. The individual testimonies were simple and powerful. We left the school with a sense of what we were in Los Angeles to learn.

The next morning, under Sam's autocratic rule, we left at 8:00 (well almost), for Los Angeles County Hospital. We visited first the three different areas of the emergency ward. The facilities were impressive, but the realities were depressing. Although the hospital seemed surprisingly calm and unharried that morning, we were told of the bureaucratic run around, and the endless hours of waiting the Mexican Americans are subjected to. After visiting the emergency wards of the main hospital, we went to med ocho, the eighth floor of the hospital which has been designed to respond specifically to the needs of the Mexican American community. The floor had what appeared to be beautiful facilities--special pharmacy technicians, laboratories, an inhalation therapy classroom. But it seemed strangely empty. There were a few Chicanos in the wards we saw, but very few. Mostly we saw empty beds. Afterward, we had a brief session with the doctor in charge. He pointed out, and the community people with us confirmed, the difficulties of ever getting admitted to med school Many members of the community are unaware of its existence. Those who do know about it are often dissuaded from entering the ward by the admissions office downstairs. Aside from the obvious lack of use, the ward illustrated another problem we were to become very familiar with. There were virtually no Mexican American staff members. We saw both white and black nurses, doctors, technicians, orderlies, but no Chicanos. This was our first view of the discrimination in hiring that is leveled against the Mexican American. The discrimination of course extends beyond the actual employment of Chicano people. One of the reasons there are no Chicano doctors is that so few of them, until very recently, have been admitted to medical school. In 1971, out of a total of 43,000 medical students in the United States, 247 of them were Mexican American. For a population with tremendous medical needs, this seems a paltry attempt at undoing past discrimination.

After med ocho, we visited the first elected Mexican American judge, Leopoldo Sanchez, in his courtroom. The Judge spoke to us at some length. His quiet, measured manner made the pride the community felt in him understandable. He represented so much personal strength and conviction. He spoke of what happens to the Mexican American when he comes to this country. How he is great in Mexico, and how he fails in America. He spoke of the oppression under which the Chicanos live--of the overwhelming sensation of ineffectualness. The young Chicano growing up in America learns very early that he doesn't have a chance. The Mexican American suffers here from a kind of paranoia. They have been ill treated for so long that it is now difficult to recognize equitable treatment. And finally, the Judge made us aware of another area where the Mexican American has suffered devastating discrimination. In the courts. Since his election as governor, Ronald Reagan has appointed over 300 judges. One of them was Mexican American.

We left Judge Sanchez, boarded our now familiar bus, and headed for the Plaza de la Raza. This is one of the few parks that has been salvaged from the growth that has characterized East Los Angeles. The park has suffered from neglect, and as we saw it, was depressingly deteriorated. But we heard from the community people of plans to construct a center of Mexican culture, a center where all the Chicano people of Los Angeles can gather and feel proud. For once the plans don't seem to have been thwarted. Money for the project is forthcoming, and we saw a display of/ plans for some exciting architectural structures. A symbol of hope.

On to Lincoln High School where the by now starving group was treated to another supurb Mexican lunch, this time cooked by a vocational education class learning to be caterers.
The principal of the high school spoke at some length about what he, as a new Mexican American principal, was trying to do with the school. The school had many of the same problems that characterize all urban schools--vandalism, drop outs and over-crowding--but there was a sense of community. We had a chance during lunch to speak with some of the students and the teachers,

and one sensed that there was a strong commitment to improvement. This obviously committed principal stressed that he would use any method necessary to save the school. Provided he retains his enthusiasm, which might be difficult given the intransigence of the bureaucracy he is fighting, the school probably will make it. It by no means presented the hopeless picture we would later see at other schools.

We went from Lincoln High to Ramona Gardens, a housing project for 2500 people, mostly Mexican American. We spoke with the white director of the project. Our experience with him gave us a small taste of the treatment the Mexican Americans receive at the hands of many Anglo people. He spoke of "those" people (by this time we had at least ten community people travelling with us), and of "delinquent parents". Someone among us asked what improvements he thought the project needed. He could cite none. Instead, he mechanically listed the good things about the project, the English classes and the new gym (which the community people said had taken years to be approved). Those of us from Washington sat back helplessly while the community berated him, and he responded defensively in non-answers.

On to the East Los Angeles Multiple Service Center. This is a huge complex of three buildings, each seemingly serving a number of different functions, the exact identity of which remain obscure. We wandered through the buildings, up and down stairs, in and out of generally empty waiting rooms, past employment offices, listings of jobs available (a quick perusal indicated they were mostly non-skilled, low-paying tasks), family planning clinics, child health care centers, veterans affairs offices. We spoke with the director, who after the duplicity of the housing project director, was refreshingly candid. He agreed with the community about many of the problems of the center--the lack of meaningful, skilled jobs, the bureaucracy of civil service and state employment agencies, the problems of information dissemination (like so many service oriented places we saw, the Center was unknown and/or inaccessible to a large portion of the community). The director told us that the unemployment rate among Mexican Americans in the community was about 25%; the underemployment rate was much higher. One of the major problems as he stated it was the changing emphasis of the Department of Labor. When the Center was initially erected, there had been a real concern with the delivery of services--money was available to insure that a community person seeking help could come to the Center and find all the services that he needed in one central place. Now the money has been cut back,and the Department of Labor is interested primarily in job placement. An effective delivery system is no longer a priority.

We ate dinner across the street at the Casa Don Miguel, a small restaurant owned and run by a Mexican American couple. Some of us spoke after dinner to the wife. Although she mentioned how exhausting the business of owning a restaurant is, she did say that they were able to do it because the Small Business Bureau in Washington insisted on lending them enough money to make a good restaurant. To date, most of the money they make goes to the repayment of the loan, but she seemed hopeful that if their stamina held out, they would make it. Maybe Washington has done some good for someone?

We returned for an evening meeting to Belvedere Junior High School, the site of our dinner the night before. Ophalia Flores, the new principal of the school, spoke with us first about the discrimination she had suffered as a Mexican American professional. She was placed as principal in the school only when the community demanded it. The parents of the school went en masse to the generally unresponsive Los Angeles School Board and insisted that Ms. Flores be appointed. She was, under a recent special provision that allowed for the appointment of Mexican American administrators who were not on the approved list. Ms. Flores spoke to us in the school library. As she talked about the pride and the willingness of the community to work for their children's education, many of us looked around the room at the brightly colored banners and hundreds of face-forward, appealing books, and got some sense of what she was saying. There was a strong sense of participation and caring there. Later, after a slide show about the Title I project in the school, we wandered out into the halls to speak with parents and teachers who were there that evening for an open house. Some of the rooms were dark and unappealing. Most were alive and exciting, and filled with things depicting Chicanos as accomplished people. The school was jammed that night with parents, kids and teachers. There was activity and excitment everywhere. This school, which had earlier suffered demonstrations and riots, seemed, at least at this point in time, as if it was going to make it.

The end of our first full day.

Early Friday morning we arrived at Hollenbeck Jr. High School. Frank Armendariz, the principal, and a few of the teachers and community people spoke to us in the auditorium about their school. Hollenbeck was a different school from the two we had earlier visited. There was no sense of community or feeling of excitement here. Instead, we saw horribly crowded, inadequate facilities, and chaotic, dreary classrooms. Mr. Armendariz spoke movingly of the myriad problems of the school; one had a sense of his total helplessness in the face of so much that was so bad. The school does not have one teacher from the surrounding barrio, and only 2% of the staff is Mexican American. It has 122 students who read below the third grade, and 300 who do not even speak English (more of these are arriving daily). It has tremendous problems with the police, the latest being the force's decision to pick up any student they think should be in school. The curriculum is tracked throughout, and the only effort to raise the track level appeared to be one relatively small Title I enrichment program. This involves 500 students from the lower tracks, who have been determined by their teachers to be high potential/low achievers (teachers are the only means of chosing the participants). The students are removed from their regular classes for three periods a day, and placed in special reading and math classes. Judging from both the teachers' comments, and from one of the special reading classes we later observed, the program has had minimal effect.

Mr. Armendariz showed us the eating area for the students--3300 meals a day are served at the school on the federal breakfast/lunch program. But because of earthquake damage, there is no enclosed cafeteria. Regardless of the weather, the students must eat outside under huge, concrete umbrellas. It was quite cold that morning; January must have been unbearable. We also visited a converted bathroom used until a couple of weeks before for a classroom. Plywood walls had been hastily erected around the toilets; a bare light bulb was suspended from the ceiling. Then we wandered through the different classrooms. One remedial class was supposedly engaged in a discussion of their work sheets. Instead, chaos and disorder reigned. In another wing we visited the vocational education classes. One class we visited appeared to have only 10th grade boys. The teacher was reading to them from a mimeographed sheet; he was telling them how to light a gas stove. In another voc ed class we saw boys making crosses out of a few scraps of plexiglass. The school seemed burdened by irrelevancy and bitterness. The aimless wanderings of the kids indicated that they were turned off; the glazed, hopeless shrugs of the teachers must have meant they were tired of trying.

After Hollenbeck, the group from Washington headed in two different directions. Some visited a local high school. Others went to visit bilingual classrooms in two elementary schools. The first school with a bilingual program we visited was the Bridge St. school, which serves a predominantly lower, working class area. The bilingual programs at the school are funded by Title VII of ESEA. The teachers in the program had been hand picked by school administrators and community residents, on the basis of their attitude and fluency in Spanish. We watched three classes here. The school was very lively. The smallest kindergarteners were speaking both Spanish and English--often they would say something in one language, and then easily repeat it in the other. We spoke with one teacher who was glowing with enthusiasm for the program. She said that in the thirteen years she has taught, nothing has been so successful or so happy as the two years she has spent teaching in the bilingual classroom. We left the Bridge St. school and went to City Terrace which serves a more middle class neighborhood. Generally the program was the same here. We watched children practicing bilingual puppet shows, performing in skits, reading and listening to tapes of Lady and the Tramp in both Spanish and English. Again the school was alive with noise and chatter. Most of the children in this school began school with no knowledge of Spanish. Some began with no knowledge of English. The children were at first taught in their dominant language, and then as confidence increases, the second language began to enter the curriculum. It was particularly exciting to see children helping each other with their language, pridefully sharing their knowledge.

We ate dinner across the street at the Casa Don Miguel, a small restaurant owned and run by a Mexican American couple. Some of us spoke after dinner to the wife. Although she mentioned how exhausting the business of owning a restaurant is, she did say that they were able to do it because the Small Business Bureau in Washington insisted on lending them enough money to make a good restaurant. To date, most of the money they make goes to the repayment of the loan, but she seemed hopeful that if their stamina held out, they would make it. Maybe Washington has done some good for someone?

We returned for an evening meeting to Belvedere Junior High School, the site of our dinner the night before. Ophalia Flores, the new principal of the school, spoke with us first about the discrimination she had suffered as a Mexican American professional. She was placed as principal in the school only when the community demanded it. The parents of the school went en masse to the generally unresponsive Los Angeles School Board and insisted that Ms. Flores be appointed. She was, under a recent special provision that allowed for the appointment of Mexican American administrators who were not on the approved list. Ms. Flores spoke to us in the school library. As she talked about the pride and the willingness of the community to work for their children's education, many of us looked around the room at the brightly colored banners and hundreds of face-forward, appealing books, and got some sense of what she was saying. There was a strong sense of participation and caring there. Later, after a slide show about the Title I project in the school, we wandered out into the halls to speak with parents and teachers who were there that evening for an open house. Some of the rooms were dark and unappealing. Most were alive and exciting, and filled with things depicting Chicanos as accomplished people. The school was jammed that night with parents, kids and teachers. There was activity and excitment everywhere. This school, which had earlier suffered demonstrations and riots, seemed, at least at this point in time, as if it was going to make it.

The end of our first full day.

Early Friday morning we arrived at Hollenbeck Jr. High School. Frank Armendariz, the principal, and a few of the teachers and community people spoke to us in the auditorium about their school. Hollenbeck was a different school from the two we had earlier visited. There was no sense of community or feeling of excitment here. Instead, we saw horribly crowded, inadequate facilities, and chaotic, dreary classrooms. Mr. Armendariz spoke movingly of the myriad problems of the school; one had a sense of his total helplessness in the face of so much that was so bad. The school does not have one teacher from the surrounding barrio, and only 2% of the staff is Mexican American. It has 122 students who read below the third grade, and 300 who do not even speak English (more of these are arriving daily). It has tremendous problems with the police, the latest being the force's decision to pick up any student they think should be in school. The curriculum is tracked throughout, and the only effort to raise the track level appeared to be one relatively small Title I enrichment program. This involves 500 students from the lower tracks, who have been determined by their teachers to be high potential/low achievers (teachers are the only means of chosing the participants). The students are removed from their regular classes for three periods a day, and placed in special reading and math classes. Judging from both the teachers' comments, and from one of the special reading classes we later observed, the program has had minimal effect.

Mr. Armendariz showed us the eating area for the students--3300 meals a day are served at the school on the federal breakfast/lunch program. But because of earthquake damage, there is no enclosed cafeteria. Regardless of the weather, the students must eat outside under huge, concrete umbrellas. It was quite cold that morning; January must have been unbearable. We also visited a converted bathroom used until a couple of weeks before for a classroom. Plywood walls had been hastily erected around the toilets; a bare light bulb was suspended from the ceiling. Then we wandered through the different classrooms. One remedial class was supposedly engaged in a discussion of their work sheets. Instead, chaos and disorder reigned. In another wing we visited the vocational education classes. One class we visited appeared to have only 10th grade boys. The teacher was reading to them from a mimeographed sheet; he was telling them how to light a gas stove. In another voc ed class we saw boys making crosses out of a few scraps of plexiglass. The school seemed burdened by irrelevancy and bitterness. The aimless wanderings of the kids indicated that they were turned off; the glazed, hopeless shrugs of the teachers must have meant they were tired of trying.

After Hollenbeck, the group from Washington headed in two different directions. Some visited a local high school. Others went to visit bilingual classrooms in two elementary schools. The first school with a bilingual program we visited was the Bridge St. school, which serves a predominantly lower, working class area. The bilingual programs at the school are funded by Title VII of ESEA. The teachers in the program had been hand picked by school administrators and community residents, on the basis of their attitude and fluency in Spanish. We watched three classes here. The school was very lively. The smallest kindergarteners were speaking both Spanish and English--often they would say something in one language, and then easily repeat it in the other. We spoke with one teacher who was glowing with enthusiasm for the program. She said that in the thirteen years she has taught, nothing has been so successful or so happy as the two years she has spent teaching in the bilingual classroom. We left the Bridge St. school and went to City Terrace which serves a more middle class neighborhood. Generally the program was the same here. We watched children practicing bilingual puppet shows, performing in skits, reading and listening to tapes of Lady and the Tramp in both Spanish and English. Again the school was alive with noise and chatter. Most of the children in this school began school with no knowledge of Spanish. Some began with no knowledge of English. The children were at first taught in their dominant language, and then as confidence increases, the second language began to enter the curriculum. It was particularly exciting to see children helping each other with their language, pridefully sharing their knowledge.

While one group was visiting the bilingual classrooms, another group was taken by some of the community to see Garfield High School. Since our arrival in East Los Angeles, we had heard of the horrors of Garfield. It was very overcrowded. The group spent most of its time there speaking with the school librarian. She told us of the frustrations of completely inadequate facilities. They surely were inadequate. The library consisted wholly of two small classrooms. We asked her if she received any materials under Title II of ESEA, and she said, yes, but when they arrived, she had no place to put them. So she sends them to individual classroom teachers, and quickly looses track. She has no way of knowing if the materials are even used. After talking with her, we walked through the school, viewing more of the listlessness and discontent we had witnessed that morning at Hollenbeck.

We regrouped at El Sereno Junior High for lunch. We ate in the school library with teachers and people from the community. After the meal, many of the Chicanos present talked to us of their concerns. We heard repeated some of the frustrations that the community had expressed to us that first night at Belvedere. Again the simple, strong statements; the demands not for special favors, but for equal treatment. One woman spoke to us in Spanish; our turn to feel the discomfort of a foreign language.

We returned to Belvedere for what was to be the last program of the trip. We heard first from a panel of community people. Mrs. Lopez told us again of the humiliations of being a welfare recipient, and of the miseducation that has characterized the Chicano's experience in American schools. Another man spoke to us at length about the problem of narcotics in the Mexican American community, and of efforts to combat the drug traffic. We heard from a Chicano woman who by the barrio standards has "made it". She owns her own business, and she told us of her struggles and her lack of preparation to deal with the business world. The panel ended by the participants and other members of the audience turning to us and again demanding what we intended to do when we returned to Washington. What could we do for them? What *would* we do for them?

We concluded the afternoon in Belvedere's auditorium watching a group of young Chicano performers. They sang, danced and recited poetry. Their arrival served as a kind of release for us. By this time, most of us were fairly tired of our characterization as the "evil Washington/bureaucrats."

As tired as we were, our final evening at La Fonda with Frank Alderete and Frank Paz was a warm success. We listened to a great mariachi band and ate a last tasty Mexican meal. The trip that had started just two and a half days before was now over. We all emerged from the experience with our own set of feelings and convictions. However different those were, we now had at least some understanding of the conditions in the Los Angeles Barrio. We had seen much of the warmth and color of the Chicanos; at the same time we now sensed some of their despair. It will be interesting to see what, if anything, will come of our new sensitivity.

--reported by Sharon Enright
(26 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

A REPORT: "THE NATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION FOR BLACKS"

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
Democrat, Twenty-first District of California
DR. BERNARD C. WATSON
Professor and Chairman of Urban Education, Temple University

Thursday, May 11, 1972

The National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks sought to throw light on the factors inhibiting the effective education of Black Americans and to consider and recommend policies which could help develop the full potential of the Nation's Black people. Over 700 (predominantly black) persons affiliated with education at all levels attended this Conference which was held in Washington from March 30 to April 1. The Conference was convened under the auspices of the Congressional Black Caucus and was sponsored by: The Congressional Black Caucus with Delta Theta Sorority, Metropolitan Applied Research Center, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Council of Negro Women, National Urban Coalition, National Urban League, United Negro College Fund, and the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. Assistance was also rendered to the Conference by the Institute for Educational Leadership of The George Washington University.

Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, senior member of the Congressional Black Caucus and a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, served as chairman of the Conference. Mr. Hawkins centered his remarks primarily on the origins and accomplishments of the Conference. Mr. Hawkins underscored the strong feelings among the members of the Black Caucus concerning the desirability of learning from various Black American leaders their ideas and opinions regarding education. With three members of the Black Caucus on the House Committee on Education and Labor, such an expression of informed Black opinion could be a most significant aid in helping to determine voting strategy on pending bills, as well as to surface and highlight those educational matters most important to Black Americans for future legislative consideration. The sponsors of the Conference thus saw it serving a practical, advisory function, but in addition they also hoped it would prove a catalyst for discussion among Black Americans throughout the Nation on what ought to be our present and future educational policy.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Because of both its scope and accomplishments, Mr. Hawkins termed the Conference as pivotal for Black education. For the first time, over 700 Blacks representing a wide spectrum of social and educational thought gathered together to express their interest in doing something to improve Black education. By profession the Conference participants included over 300 educators, 123 representatives from various levels of government, 86 students, 132 community activists, 7 Congressional staff members, 6 ministers, and 36 parents. And yet, despite the large size of this gathering, the Conference still had to turn away several hundred persons wishing to attend--a significant demonstration of the interest in education among Black Americans.

Among its accomplishments, the National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks achieved each of its major objectives. Participants initiated a dialog on the issues confronting Black education. In preparation for the workshops of the Conference, many hundreds of pages of useful background studies, legal analysis, and philosophical inquiry were prepared. Many of these studies are now being readied for wider distribution, including insertion in the Congressional Record.

In the realm of practical politics, the Conference provided its sponsors with the opportunity for consultation on education with individuals whose views are respected and whose credentials are superb. In fact, this consultation aspect of the Conference proved so useful that it has stimulated a move to establish some form of on-going advisory group for continued recommendation on educational policy.

In addition, both because of its publicity and because it brought together individuals interested in continuing to work to improve Black education, the Conference has proven already a stimulant to many local groups to increase their efforts for Black educational goals.

Mr. Hawkins concluded his remarks by warning that there are bigots who are trying to use education as a weapon to create disunity in the United States. Because of such persons, education can be used to threaten and divide an integrated society. Instead, we must use education to help unify the American people. And we must move to insure that all Americans have access to equal opportunities in education as well as all other areas of our society.

Dr. Bernard C. Watson, Staff Director, discussed some of the topics and issues raised during the three days of the Conference. He began by restressing the heterogeneity of this "landmark" Conference which drew its participants from 35 states and the District of Columbia. Old and young, integrationist and separatist--these were just some of the differences and valid disagreements among Conference participants.

Watson pointed to the evolution of the agenda during the Conference as one of the keys to the understanding of its significance. As the dialog in the discussion groups began to yield a picture of the substantive issues and problems facing Black Americans, there emerged a general concern about what should actually be done to strengthen and improve Black education. And as the Conference defined its own agenda, it came to emphasize that Blacks must stop reacting and start initiating the kinds of educational change that can help insure Black survival.

The Conference discussed substantive issues affecting Black education. In answer to a specific question, Watson said that the Conference did not talk about bussing--which is a non-issue since no court has ordered students bussed to achieve racial balance. What the courts have said is that school systems must desegregate. It is a substantive issue, however, when the Executive starts talking to the courts and tells them to stop carrying out the Constitution. Watson went on to say that he feared that desegration of the schools might be de-emphasized in favor of increased compensatory education. He felt that not much was being accomplished under compensatory education because the actual operating theory of most programs is that there is something wrong with the children, not the school system. Within such compensatory programs, it is the children who are "educationally deprived" and "culturally disadvantaged." And after 5 to 10 years, when such programs fail to educationally advance Black children, Watson stressed his fear of all the bigots that would emerge from the woodwork saying "they are inferior after all" and what consequences this will have on Black people.

Among the substantive issues discussed was that concerning the small numbers of Blacks involved in higher education. Despite an increase in the percentage of Blacks within American society in the last ten years, only six percent of Blacks today are college-bound. In the legal and medical professional programs, the situation is even worse: 75 percent of all Black physicians are still prepared by only two medical schools, Howard and Meharry while only 4,000 out of 300,000 attorneys in the United States are non-white.

Decentralization and the need for community control was another substantive issue discussed at the Conference. In Watson's view, the type of school decentralization being carried out in New York City is an exercise in futility. Not only are the decentralized districts there too large, but the community cannot fire either teachers or administrators and must still abide by the rules laid down by the central administration. Such a decentralization enterprise so weighted against success seems only to invite the constant admonition that decentralization has been tried and found wanting--and thus another excuse to prevent trying it elsewhere.

According to Watson, the Kerner Presidential Commission which found that the U.S. was becoming two societies wasn't really saying anything new. The nation has had two societies for a long time, sanctioned and maintained by white society. Much of the recent talk concerning "separatism" begins with the recognition of this reality. And if we continue to keep Black people ignorant and unskilled so that they can't make the decisions necessary to participate in society, then we will have preserved the rationale for saying that we cannot have an integrated society.

As these kinds of substantive issues emerged during the Conference, the participants began to emphasize the necessity of Blacks initiating the kinds of essential educational changes which can help insure survival. For example, the Conference discussed the necessity of expanding and improving Black higher education institutions. Black colleges need to expand in order to give more Blacks an opportunity for higher education. But since Black colleges were originally created to be unequal, it is also necessary to strengthen these schools which produce over 50 percent of all Black college graduates. And at the same time, Blacks must continue to batter at the doors of those colleges and universities which have traditionally served only whites.

In closing, Watson stated that the Conference sought positive approaches to the issues facing Black education and was not concerned with ideological labels which have no meaning for Black survival. The sponsoring members of the Conference represent a total of over 6 million Black constituents and the Conference thus was an important forum for the expression of Black views on education. However, it was not the intention of the Conference to make educational policy for all Black people, rather, the Conference sought "to arrive at consensus on some issues and get ideas on others."

The National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks was a beginning. On-going interest, dialog, research and reaction to research are continuing. Education, as a primary mode of socialization for mankind, is fundamental to any government or people. And Blacks must have control of their own education to achieve control of their own destiny.

Question and Answer Session (some typical questions):

Q - Aren't most compensatory education programs actually concerned with changing the schooling process for the betterment of the student?

A - (Watson). Most of the books on compensatory education focus on the "disadvantaged child" and talk about "broken homes" or "cultural deprivation", not learning. These books are by the "experts" which have an impact on the actual operation of compensatory education programs. And these experts are saying or implying that something is wrong with the child, not the system which cannot teach him.

Q - Hasn't Title I, ESEA unjustly become the target of our frustrations regarding compensatory education?

A - (Watson). The original Congressional intent regarding Title I is not at issue here. Rather the way compensatory education is actually carried out seems to imply that poor children are incapable of learning.

Q - Didn't the Coleman Report state that the environmental conditions affecting the disadvantaged child and his education should be improved?

A - (Watson). Yes. But because a child lives in rotten housing, doesn't mean that he can't learn. And because a child's social environment is bad, doesn't mean he can't learn. Assumptions about the environment too often become the reason for not trying to teach poor children. The attitude becomes-"What can you expect? This is a disadvantaged child."- and the prophecy is then self-fulfilling.

Q - What should be stressed to improve Black education?

A - There is a need to stress the strengths of poor people. We need to look at the Dunbar's of Washington and the Roosevelt's of Gary to determine what are tht things that make a successful Black school. We need to stress the humanistic aspect of education.

Q - Did the Conference get into the question of pre-service and in-service teacher training?

A - No, but we should get into these areas. We need to re-define who is a teacher and to define what a quality education should be for Blacks in the decades ahead.

Q - Did the Conference recommend or support any Federal programs?

A - This was a policy conference and thus it did not get into the specific program advocacy beyond general support for full funding of education programs and to include support for Black educational institutions now excluded from funding.

Q - What did the Conference have to say on early child development?

A - One of the Conference papers deals with this subject. The Conference discussed the need for early childhood programs and the issues and problems involved here.

Q - Was the Conference concerned with the question of prison education?

A - Yes. Three quarters of our prison population are members of a minority group. Many are in the prime of their youth and most are poorly educated. This is a most important area for further consideration and action.

Q - When will the Conference papers be published?

A - The papers go to the publisher on June 1. Some have already appeared in "Inequality in Education."

Q - Will the Conference group have an on-going existence and future consultations?

A - Whether the Conference will have a continued existence is uncertain at this time. However, both sponsors and participants have expressed a desire to have some form of continuing group discussions and further consultations. What form this will take is still under consideration at this time.

--reported by David Osman
(47 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 2000 L STREET NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON D C 20036 / (202) 293 3166

Field Trip: Education of Handicapped Children in Hartford, Connecticut Area*

November 9 - 10, 1972

The site visit began with an overview session on Thursday evening, November 9. As an introduction to the topic of education of the handicapped, ESS participants, together with their faculty hosts from the University of Connecticut, saw a film strip produced by the Council for Exceptional Children.

Mr. Gabe Simches, Special Education Consultant, Connecticut State Department of Education, then addressed the group on the status of special education in Connecticut. He outlined several factors which he felt accounted for the relatively good position of education of the handicapped in his State. They include: (1) a rather complete legal mandate; (2) a good fiscal support system providing reimbursement for all special education programs and services and; (3) enough training centers so that Connecticut, unlike most other States, does not have severe staff shortages.

Simches acknowledged that the broad picture of special education is not all "rosy"; there are definitional and operational questions which pose problems for both the educators and the systems seeking to serve handicapped kids. He pointed out that while advances in educational technology in the last decade have been great, their transfer as a viable force in special education has not been significant. In this particular area, Simches said that what is happening is not as important as what is not happening.

Simches singled out reaching agreement on a balanced level of accountability in special education as another problem. LEA's alone cannot respond to the problems of educating handicapped children--they must interface with training institutions, community agencies and parents in working out solutions.

In wrapping up the overview session, Dr. A. J. Pappanikou, Professor of Special Education, sketched the approach taken to education of the handicapped at the University of Connecticut. "Normalization" is aimed at eliminating the breach between the regular classroom and special education. The underlying principle of Dr. Pappanikou's concept is that while handicapped children require individually tailored programs, the efficacy of the self-contained special education classroom as the setting for providing these is limited.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

"Pappy" contended that special education programs should satisfy needs in terms of what we basically expect children--any and all children--to do. While some handicapped children may require supervision for the rest of their lives, their education should not be structured in terms of terminal goals. Every child should have the opportunity for unlimited adaptive growth and intellectual development. Normalization as interpreted by Dr. Pappanikou uses the individualized instruction approach to education of the handicapped.

The program on Friday, November 10, revolved around team site-visits to different types of programs for the education of the handicapped. The report that follows recounts the experiences of my group; the observations and comments represent my own insights.

Our first stop was at the Toland complex. The facilities of this school district, situated in the rural mid-state area, included three modern and well-equipped buildings housing the elementary, middle and junior high schools. Here children with learning disabilities leave their regular classrooms for part of each day and receive remedial help on a one-to-one basis. These children are identified on the basis of their classroom performance and behavior. We were advised by one first grade teacher that academic disability problems in a child are fairly obvious at an early age. Dyslexia seemed to be the most predominant handicap of Toland students.

We observed Robert, a ten year old white male, who has a serious reading deficiency. He was receiving visual discrimination training for letters and numbers. His teacher, a graduate of the UCONN training program in learning disabilities, works with him an hour a day. Her approach to remediating Robert's disability blends behavior modification techniques with the phonics method of teaching reading. Visual aids and instructional equipment have a central role in Robert's program.

We also observed several other Toland children as they interacted with their remedial education teachers. The severity of their learning disabilities varied; all, however, function in the regular classroom for the better part of the school day.

The Toland schools use special class settings, remedial services, resource facilities and early diagnosis-prescription to deal with handicapped children. One sensed that the children enrolled there were in a better than average instructional program for handicapped children. The individualized instruction approach was in effect, although the comprehensiveness of its application was questionable and there was no evidence that the school coordinated its program with other community agencies which serve children.

Leaving Toland, our group was somewhat perplexed by the question of how one defines handicapped. The children we had seen were most certainly handicapped, but only mildly disabled when compared with severely mentally retarded children or multiply physically handicapped children. These children we met at our next two stops.

The Hartford Regional Center is one of 11 regional centers operating under the auspices of the Connecticut State Department of Health, Office of Mental Retardation. This Center, serving 21 towns in the North Central and Central areas of Connecticut, provides residential and day care programs for retardates and intensive case work for families of the mentally retarded.

The basic operating principle of the Hartford Regional Center is that all services extended to the mentally retarded should sustain their rights, privileges and recognition as individuals. In no way should they prohibit the person's accessibility to experiences necessary to his complete development. The Hartford Regional Center stresses the importance of the home environment upon the well-being of the mentally retarded.

The facility accommodates 96 retardates--children and adolescents--in its residential program. Residents and day students who are transported to the Center daily participate in a variety of semi- or fully self-contained educational activities--most designed to help the children develop motor and social skills. The Center has a preschool program, a vocational training program for adolescent and adult retardates, and a group home program for those with the potential for semi-independent living. Children living in the cottage units attend the local public schools.

The Hartford Regional Center staff includes nurses, mental retardation supervisors, a psychologist, a physical therapist, social workers and various aides. Medical care is provided by the Newington Children's Hospital. Hartford Regional Center cooperates with Central Connecticut State College in its special education training program and conducts its own in-service training for Center personnel.

One of the most impressive things about Hartford Regional Center was the extent of community involvement in its program. Not only does the Center receive substantial financial support from the Hartford population, but it has an extensive volunteer program and a well-coordinated inter-agency service operation.

A short distance up the road from the Hartford Regional Center is the Newington Children's Hospital, an institution dedicated to child care since 1898. Newington Children's Hospital is a medical facility for the treatment and care of children deprived of their normal capabilities by birth defects, disease or accidents.

The hospital has pioneered programs such as: cleft palate, speech-hearing, learning disabilities, scoliosis, limb deficiencies and muscle disease. A center for specialized pediatric care, Newington has a large staff of physician specialists. The hospital has a large ambulatory service for diagnostic workup as well as follow-up.

At the Newington Children's Hospital patients are received from birth and continue through age 21, so that the effect of growth and maturation, both in the physical and psychosocial sense, takes place with continuity in the total care of the multiply handicapped. Newington provides schooling for its inpatients from preschool through the high school level and coordinates its program with the patients' regular schools. Currently there are 14 teachers and a principal on the Newington school staff.

We saw kindergarten children finger painting, fourth and fifth graders having a geography lesson via educational television and high school students discussing current literature. Classrooms were large open rooms, equipped to accommodate the hospital beds, wheelchairs and other orthopaedic equipment needed by the students. Newington Children's Hospital also has a special self-contained program for its mentally retarded patients.

Newington Children's Hospital has a large on-going clinical research program coordinated by a director of research and carried out by many members of the attending and resident staff. Forty or more projects investigating birth defects, crippling diseases and a wide variety of handicapping problems are in progress. Newington has made internationally recognized contributions in Legg-Perthes disease, cerebral palsy, and orthopaedic disorders.

A question-answer session brought the Hartford site-visit to a close. Educational Staff Seminar participants agreed that our brief exposure made it difficult to formulate any generalizations about education of the handicapped. We had seen many different programs--both good and bad--and noted the correspondingly different impact they had on children.

Finance seemed to be the key question raised and the role of the Federal government in supporting education of the handicapped the pivotal concern. Those present acknowledged Assistant Secretary Marland's remark that Federal education funding will be "lean" in the years ahead. The importance of lobby efforts were reaffirmed and there was considerable discussion of how citizens could become involved in improving the status of and support for education of the handicapped.

The need to consider the adult handicapped and to coordinate the use of all funds available for handicapped education were reinforced. Comprehensive strategies--long range plans with priorities established for education of the handicapped--must be developed by the States before great amounts of additional money will be made available for special education delivery systems.

There already are many positive, beneficial things that are being done to gain equality of educational opportunity for the handicapped. The disturbing fact is that they are not being done on an expansive enough scale. The conclusion most ESS'ers reached was that the nation must reorder its priorities if all handicapped Americans are to have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

--reported by Judith A. Pitney
(27 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY   INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

"HOW PENNSYLVANIA SERVES HANDICAPPED CHILDREN"

Thursday, December 14 - Friday, December 15, 1972

After a brief reception and dinner, the group heard comments by officials of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and discussed with them the impact of Pennsylvania's historic Right to Education consent agreement. These include: Mr. Joseph N. Lantzer, Director, the Right to Education Office; Dr. William F. Ohrtman, Director, Bureau of Special Education; and Mr. Donald M. Carroll, Jr., Deputy Secretary and Commissioner of Basic Education. Comments were also heard from Mr. Edward Goldman, Commissioner, Office of Mental Retardation and Mr. Gary Makuch, Director, Bureau of Consulting Services, Office of Mental Retardation of the Department of Public Welfare.

Dr. Ohrtman stated that all Pennsylvania districts that did not have a program for retarded children were mandated to begin one. If the district failed in this responsibility, the Intermediate Unit (the regional unit of the Department of Education) would administer the organization of one. If this failed, the Secretary of Education would implement a program. Funds for these programs were made available by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the state currently pays excess costs of such programs to the school district.

In addition, the Department of Welfare is currently working closely with the Department of Education for the complete implementation of the consent agreement. The Welfare Department is beginning a program to "train" teachers of exceptional children in the techniques necessary for the sufficient training of retarded children. A liaison office has been established between the departments of education and welfare so that the proper coordination of activities can be assured.

The impact of the consent agreement on children in welfare institutions is that the children have now gained entry into education programs which are more oriented to education than welfare. Hopefully, the two state departments will now work together to establish more comprehensive programs for all retarded children. Although children have not been taken out of the institutions as a result of the consent agreement, the future placement of children into such institutions has been greatly reduced.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Should the federal government legislate the right to education for all children, the state participants believe that there would be initial problems of shock and rejection. Repeatedly, the participants warned the group that attitudes cannot be legislated. This problem was eased in Pennsylvania because of a very sympathetic Department of Education and the help of willing adults, including many from the Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children (PARC).

The state participants urged federal categorical financial aid to all states to begin the process now begun in Pennsylvania. They stated that what Pennsylvania presently needs is restricted categorical aid for exceptional children.

Early Friday, the group heard comments from Mr. John C. Pittenger, Secretary of Education, who stressed that finances are a problem in Pennsylvania--the problem of the ideal vs. the reality of what the taxpayers can actually afford. Not only does the state need more money, it also must learn how to wisely spend its present budget.

Secretary Pittenger discussed 6 problem areas resulting from the decision: 1)lack of proper facilities; 2)lack of adequate transportation; 3)architectural barriers (the state is presently rewriting its school building code); 4)the "time lag" for an adequate supply of trained teachers in special education; and 5) the failure of current school personnel to cope with the more severely retarded children now in the system. (This results from the fact that most special educators are trained to deal with the mildlyretarded child rather than more severe forms of retardation.);6) Many public school officials still believe that the inclusion of these retarded children in the public school system is more a problem than an opportunity. These officials are, however, in the minority. None of these problems, however, have deterred the Department of Education from implementing the Right to Education agreement. These problems are currently being studied and analysed for early solutions.

According to Secretary Pittenger, the federal government should share state expenses for the education of the retarded child. He was especially hopeful about Education Revenue Sharing. The federal government should also research the unique problem of educating these children, including early diagnosis of problems before they reach school age.

The Secretary was not as adamant about restricted categorical aid as were previous state participants. He stated the concern about the "straight-jacket" effect which such aid might have on Pennsylvania. He strongly supported state based rather than federally based performance objectives in federal categorical programs.

In the session that followed, the group listened to a brief tape, part of one due process hearing resulting from the consent agreement. The group learned from Dr. Richard Sherr, hearing officer for the case, that most hearings have centered on compelling the schools to provide adequate education programs for the retarded, so that the child may remain within the public school system. This case was unusual by the fact that the parents wanted to institutionalize the child.

Due process hearings in Pennsylvania assure that the needs of the child are taken care of. Many cases have been dropped due to the ability of the school systems to assign children to programs.

Pennsylvania is now questioning the focus of institutional programming. Pennsylvania favors de-institutionalization through community-based "group homes". Although there is a waiting list for institutions in the state, Pennsylvania currently provides interim-care facilities for 2000--2500 children. This is one step in the beginning process of de-institutionalizing the child.

ESS participants travelled to the Right to Education Office where they learned the effects of the consent agreement at the local level. A short analysis of each representative follows:

Dr. Henry Hoerner, School Administrator, representing a small-town, rural district stressed the need for increased federal funds to supplement state and school district spending. In his district, the parents feared the legalities involved in the current system. (The parents now need to sign a document before their child enters a special education program.) This has resulted in less enthusiastic support by the parents.

Mrs. E. Ruof, School Psychologist; her main concern was the "lumping together" of all forms of retardation. This grouping makes it extremely difficult for the teachers to meet the students' needs. One of the major benefits resulting from the consent agreement is the fact that the parents now do not have to pay for their child's education. Many parents expect "too much" as a result of the right to education consent agreement. They often expect that the child can be educated, when in reality, the child might only be trainable.

Dr. Richard Sherr, Intermediate Unit Director of Special Education, outlined the problems resulting from the decision and the steps taken to overcome these problems.

1) Financial Resources -- Pennsylvania increased financial aid to schools in his Intermediate Unit from 10.7 percent to 18.5 percent.

2) Staffing and Materials -- As a result of the Right to Education suit, classes increased by 10, enrollment increased by 110 and staff by 20.

3) Facilities -- Often space was not avialable in public schools and there were often architectural barriers with which to cope.

Classes have been placed in churches and other public and private facilities.

Mrs. Linda Cummings, teacher, informed us that materials available for her use were not suitable for lower-functioning students. New materials are necessary. A second problem came from dealing with mixed levels of handicapped children in the same classroom and urged greater cooperation between parents and teachers. She felt that the school setting lent to the the socializing of the exceptional child.

Dr. Richard Myers, Teacher Trainer, spoke about the impact of the consent agreement on present education programs:

1) An increased emphasis on the severely handicapped in education courses.
2) Need to re-evaluate existing education programs.

The impact for the future:

1) Develop training programs for current teachers and personnel to handle severely handicapped children.
2) Need for paraprofessional training programs.
3) Extension of current programs to include other groups of exceptional children, i.e., the gifted child.

Dr. Myers stated that the PARC decision has elevated the teacher's role in Pennsylvania. He then briefly outlined the competencies that he believes a teacher now needs. (The question of the "level of competency" of teachers had been discussed previously and it was affirmed that this level is not yet known.) Dr. Myers' new competencies are as follows:

1) effectively working in team settings
2) supervising paraprofessionals and home trainers
3) counselling and teaching of parents
4) establishing measurable goals
5) use of instructional methods, i.e., behavioral modification
6) teaching skills to foster self-care
7) ability to modify child behavior
8) develop a broader view of education

Mr. William Benson, Regional Field Coordinator, stated that because of the PARC decision, parents and school officials are pushing for the education of all children. The biggest change is in the attitudes of people -- they are now beginning to realize the full extent to which retarded children can be educated. As Mr. Benson witnesses, the PARC decision has meant CHANGE.

ESS met in a final session with parents of retarded children who have entered the public school system as a result of the right to education consent agreement. After a brief history of each child's case, the parents gave their views on what they believe should be done in the future to insure their child's further educational progress.

All agreed that better communication must exist between the parents and teachers. More meetings should be set up between themselves and teachers. Observations of the children in school should be available. Adequate equipment should be made available so that the children may be exposed to all facets of training. Transportation was also needed as was continuity in programs and additional training for teachers and professionals.

Two specific programs were also outlined by the parents. Summer programs should be established so that education will be able to continue. A program for the child after age 21, i.e., sheltered workshops, residential care facilities, should also be established.

--reported by Sharon Holroyd
(21 participants)

PART VII

VIEWPOINTS: ON EDUCATION IN OTHER NATIONS

Education in other nations can, conceivably, provide our system with alternatives to our traditional ways of educating. Moreover, a carefully constructed overseas study mission can challenge the Federal policy aide to think anew about the role of education in modern society and about the true meaning of much of his/her daily responsibilities. ESS' "comparative education" programs present opportunities for federal educational policy makers in two principal ways:

First, ESS is conducting a series of dinner-discussions and all-day seminars on topics ranging from early childhood education in Europe to compensatory education in Israel.

Second, beginning with a two-week trip to the Soviet Union in October 1971, ESS has organized four extended educational visits overseas. These include a second study mission to the Soviet Union (November 1972), to Israel (May 1972), and Japan (December 1972). Separate extended reports on the first Soviet field trip and on the Israel field trip may be obtained from the Educational Staff Seminar office. They are entitled, respectively, Impressions of Education in the U.S.S.R. (1971) and Impressions of Education in Israel (1973).

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY *INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP*

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* PRESENTATION ON "REPORT OF A FIELD TRIP: EDUCATION IN THE U.S.S.R."

Wednesday, December 8, 1971

This meeting was slightly different from other ESS dinner meetings in that the speakers were broken into roughly two sections, with several speaking before dinner was served, and the rest following the meal. This had the advantage of setting a tone for conversation during dinner, and was especially valuable because of the mix of participants--those who had been on the recent Russia trip, those who hoped to go in the near future, and those who came for information only.

Samuel Halperin served as moderator, introducing the evening's program as three-fold in purpose: (1) an opportunity for a reunion of trip participants and mutual reflection on shared experiences; (2) an informational session for those who did not go to the Soviet Union; (3) an orientation for those Congressional staff planning to visit the U.S.S.R. with the House Select Subcommittee on Education.

Logan Sallada: "Vignettes of Soviet Life." We received an over-view of three very urban areas--Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad, with the limitations of the Intourist official presentation, and only occasional contacts of an unplanned nature.

Two impressions that remain: (a) Soviet leadership has kept the horrors of the destruction carried out by the German Army before the people for a purpose ("twenty million Soviet citizens wiped out"); (b) a pervading sense of limitation of personal freedom.

Conversations with young student members at the Friendship Society evidenced interest in student movements in the United States. They could not understand the concept of revolving student leadership in U. S. Questions that came up: the drug problem in U.S.; "what is freedom--drugs, muggings on the streets?".

Some memorable impressions: "no slums as we know them, old women sweeping streets; spotless subways; active street life at night; unlimited cultural amenities; crowded museums on Sundays.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Judy Lamontagne: "Soviet System of Education," with a focus on the gifted.

My basic impression--universal education in the Soviet Union does not mean equality of education; rather better equipment and resources are focused on the gifted. They are considered as "a resource of the State."

Types of special education:

1. Artistically gifted: receive 11 years rather than 10, and a longer day at school. Children of unusual talent are recommended by parents or teachers. Special schools are concentrated in the cities. Children living in the rural areas can be sponsored by a variety of organizations--workers' groups, etc. A major 'talent scout' organization is the Young Pioneer Palaces.

2. Special language schools: these are supposedly not for the elite, and are 10-year schools with a longer school day. Teachers receive 15 percent bonuses. Pupils are selected through testing. Graduates of these schools have a greater chance of going on to higher education.

3. Scientific boarding schools: these serve cadres of academically talented youngsters, particularly in physics and chemistry. Lomonosov, mentioned as the "Leonardo" of Russia who walked across Russia to Moscow to obtain an education, is held up as the example. Soviet educators: "We would not want to miss a Lomonosov." National competitions are held in the various sciences and mathematics. Expenses are paid by local Pioneer Palaces or sponsoring groups. Successful competitors are admitted to boarding schools for an intensive 3-year course; graduation carries automatic admission to the university.

I was told there was a new emphasis on language schools; boarding schools are on the increase; my over-all impression was of a far greater degree of narrow, specialized training.

Sherry Arnstein: "Preschool Education in the U.S.S.R."

We found you don't need to be told that children are a top priority in the Soviet Union: the children are relatively well-dressed; budget allotments for children's programs are relatively generous; the level of equipment and general attractiveness is relatively high.

Some data: great pride in the fact that 80 percent of the children are in kindergartens; any new construction of factories must include provision for day care.

Conclusion: we have much to learn from the Soviet Union in day care. U.S.S.R. hopes for 12 million children in kindergartens in current plan. Curriculum directives are minutely detailed--food, songs, equipment, etc. specified. There are no inconsistences, everyone agrees that *good* is discipline, strong set of values, obedience, respect, control. *Bad*, on the other hand, is Dewey, Dalton, etc.

We saw: pervasive orderliness; *work* taught as respectful, important (cleaning up, mending toys, serving food, etc.); Hours from 6:30 am to 7:30 pm with boarding for special occasions; all-female staff; no parent participation in planning (parents were *instructed*, not consulted); pressure on parent re behavior; teachers' pay low in comparison to factory workers.

At the Institute of Pedagogical Science in Moscow we were told that innovations take six years to get into the kindergartens. They did not seem to be engaged in research as we know it--more involved in observations, report writing, etc.

A major change in the "new curriculum" is that first grade work, reading and writing and numbers, are now taught in the kindergarten in the last year. In the United States, by contrast, we see "diversity, paucity, and potentiality."

Judy Miller: "Pioneer Palaces and the Public Education System." Generally, Pioneer Palaces are meant to train young children to become future Communist Party members. There is restricted, limited membership. PP's serve as adjuncts to the school system, operating after school hours.

The Kiev Pioneer Palace we visited was beautiful, obviously a showplace. Some impressions and facts that stood out: there is a concern for building "good citizens," not only in the schools, but especially in the PP's; Young Pioneers are favored; budget for the Kiev PP was 1,000,000 rubles for the year.

Comparison to the school system: both highly structured, both highly disciplined; the PP emphasized vocational and cultural activities. We asked, "What relationship is there to the school system?" We were told "None." In fact, many teachers work for extra pay in the afternoons at the PP's.

A pervasive impression: Lenin is God; deep reverence for the Party.

Ron Hall: "Bi-lingualism in the Soviet Union." Official policy: "Every Soviet citizen has the right to education in his native language."

In Russian schools, a foreign language is started in the 4th grade. The foreign language schools (i.e., English, French, etc.) are pointed to with pride. Questions: is there a Russification program? No so, we were told. I was skeptical before our visit, but that seems to be the case.

Russian schools seemed relatively standard throughout; not so, nationality schools, though there was little data on these schools. Non-Russian schools had entire curriculum in Armenian, Ukrainian, etc. Except for the program for "northerners" (Eskimos) at the Hertzen Institute, languages are taught as a separate subject.

Conclusion: bi-lingualism and bi-culturism seem to be working in Russia; minority groups have the opportunity to interact as equals up to the national level.

Suzanne Woolsey: "Hertzen Teacher Training Institute." Def: an "Institute of higher learning" has a one-subject emphasis; a "university" is comparable to our diversified institutions.

Facts on Hertzen, one of the best in the country: (1) founded in 1918 (right after Revolution); (2) a major accomplishment--developing written language for the Eskimos; (3) secondary teachers receive 70 percent of instruction in subject areas, 30 percent in teaching methods and "political psychology" (i.e., Marxism-Leninism); (4) practice teaching occurs more widely than in U.S., (a) 2nd year, students serve as counselors in summer camps for Young Pioneers, (b) 3rd year, practice teaching under experienced teacher, (c) 4th year, practice teaching more or less on one's own.

"Re-training" or "in-service" training is only for official groups such as "Northerners" who come back on a regular schedule for re-training. They do have, however, "Institutes for higher qualification of teachers."

The Director of Hertzen impressed me as brilliant, interested, enthusiastic. His particular interest is educational TV. He told us that programming is directed to the 4th through 8th classes, with the philosophy, "TV should bring what the teacher cannot bring to the classroom." Broadcasts are planned to illustrate what given classes are studying at a given time; a centralized curriculum makes this possible.

Ken Adelman: "Patrice Lumumba University" (Moscow)

This university was designed for foreign students of the Third World, 90 percent of its students are from Africa, Asia, South America. The curriculum is keyed to developmental problems.

The event of the day was a rally for Angela Davis's sister. After inflammatory, loudly-cheered speeches from Russians and others comparing the U.S. to Nazi Germany, Miss Davis's sister persented a mild (by comparison) and balanced criticism of the U. S. judicial system.

Len Strickman: "Encounters in the Soviet Union."

Impressions: 1. Moscow. We become "entangled" with several drunk young men on the street, several others appeared and "deflected" the drunks. Question: were we protected or watched?

2. Kiev. Students met casually, at bars, on the street, were interested in changing money, and in making purchases in foreign currency shops. Question on whether there are student demonstrations in U.S.S.R. brought the response, "two a year--May 1 and November 7." Essentially, there's no political opposition. "Papa Lenin, the father of our great democracy!" said one student with slight derision.

3. Leningrad. We attempted to visit a synagogue Friday night, found it closed, but met a young Jew who came up to us and offered help. He was an engineer, lived with his doctor wife, two young children and parents in one-room flat. (See notes on "Grischa" in Samuel Halperin's impressions of Soviet Jewry.

Generally, we felt we got very limited information. What we did feel was fear, rather than obvious intimidation.

Russ Edgerton: "Our Trip to the U.S.S.R. and its Relevance for Policy Planners." Four propositions about what I learned:

A. Most of what I learned I learned about general life in Soviet cities and most of this through my eyes.

B. I didn't learn very much about how Russians feel, but I learned a lot about how I would feel if I were them; i.e., Soviets have over-built their secondary schools in proportion to their higher institutions so that there are a lot of unmet aspirations. "I want to go to an institute but know that I can't." I felt sobriety, moodiness. While I couldn't generalize about their feelings, I found it depressing.

C. In terms of the educational institutions, most of what I learned was descriptive rather than explanatory; a lecture format. What we didn't hear was--What works? What's effective? Are the technical schools really good?

D. My sense of the whole was much better than my understanding of the individual parts; i.e., the incentive system, the mechanics of educational TV.

Putting together my insights into Soviet life, I think I have a real image of Soviet life; putting together the things I learned about life and the educational system, I think I do have a feeling about Soviet education.

How relevant to educational policy? Perhaps nothing applies directly to American planning and manpower. In the Soviet Union education is geared to manpower requirements.

I gained a generalized sense of the Soviet Union, a perspective gained from two weeks wandering around in a strictly structured society. I'm taking a fresh look at American schools and finding them not so authoritarian, after all. The trip occasioned questions, fresh perspectives, new insights; it was relevant, but not easily translatable.

Several participants felt a few additional comments should be added.

Lyle Spencer: I can't let this evening go by without commenting on my own strong impression: any comment or criticism of the system must take into account where they've come from; the intense "love of land"; their obvious pride in their military strength; the sense of security gained from this; "never again will we be invaded as we were in the "Patriotic War" (World War II).

Sylvester Williams: Two points: (1) I did not feel surveillance. (2) I was impressed by the work ethic. The most menial jobs are seen as a contribution to society, giving dignity to the individual as a contributor to society.

-- reported by Trude Wright
(attendance: 69 persons)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:*

"EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION: A EUROPEAN POINT OF VIEW"

Monday, April 3, 1972

Dr. Karl Stukát, Department of Educational Research, Gothenburg School of Education, Gothenburg, Sweden

Dr. Anthony de Vries, Pedagogisch Instutuut Van De Rijksunversiteit, Utrecht, Netherlands

Dr. Olaf Magnussen, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France

Dr. Gilbert R. Austin, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France

Dr. Stukát's general background remarks:

1 - Swedish pre-school runs from two to six years of age: compulsory education does not commence until age seven.

2 - Pre-school takes two forms in Sweden: day nursery (full day) and kindergarten (three hours per day).

3 - Kindergarten and nursery school basically follow the same curriculum.

4 - The nursery school enrollment is mostly comprised of the low income children (women are wanted and needed in the labor force), while the children of the more affluent dominate the kindergarten.

5 - Less than fifty per cent of all the eligible children are actually enrolled in either the kindergarten or nursery schools; there are long waiting lists.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Dr. Stukat's main topic: Evaluation of the Swedish System

In 1965 an evaluation of the programs in place was undertaken. The evaluation was based on matched sets (those in the program matched with peers who were not in school), and covered children in the first, second and third years of the programs. The areas of comparison were:

- Physical Development
- Motor Development - fine and gross
- Social and Cultural Development
- Interests and Activities
- Knowledge and Achievement
- School Readiness and School Achievement

Results and Conclusions

1 - There was very little difference between the development of the program and non-program children. This was a great disappointment to many people but not to Dr. Stukat because most informal indexes had already led him to perceive this.

2 - Where there were differences, these differences were in areas where the in-program children received some clear-cut, structured or directed educational experience, i.e. the acquisition of abstract knowledge. This finding clashed with the Swedish notion that pre-school was basically a non-teaching process.

3 - It was found that objectives based on official policy statements were too vague and imprecise for accurate measurement purposes.

As a result of the findings of the 1965 evaluation, some new program elements and designs were initiated. The goal of these was to:

- Refine and expand objective statements
- Foster planned learning
- Foster socialization through structured activities, i.e. games in which the whole group wins instead of one individual.

The new, expanded program was field-tested and the results evaluated through direct observation. Results were as follows:

1 - Social Development - considerable improvement

2 - Language Development - good improvement especially in vocabulary building

3 - Concept Development - considerable improvement, especially in social, scientific and number concepts

4 - Attitudes - generally improved

It was also found that the children were less domineering and far less punitive.

Still another observation made was that the teachers were more nurturing, less domineering, less ordered, but more indirective in their pupil/teacher relationships.

Dr. de Vries' Presentation:

1- The Netherlands, unlike Sweden, has only been in early childhood research for the past three or four years.

2- Special programs are targeted mostly for the low income (60 percent of the low income are in special programs)

3- Between 90 and 100 percent of all eligible children are enrolled in the kindergarten, but the classes are very large - around 39 per class.

4- By and large, the programs have not been very successful in achieving their educational goals and Dr. de Vries appeared very pessimistic about the successes in the near future.

Discussion of Project Effort

A project entitled "Hidden Talent" had determined that there was no lost or hidden talent in the nation. It was contended that the five percent or so students who made it through the lower school and on to higher education was in fact the sum total of those who were mentally capable of higher studies! It was, said Dr. de Vries, an attempt to find out what happened to the other 95% which led to the nation's interest in early childhood education. It wasn't quite clear whether these early findings led directly to the projects on which de Vries reported or not. The gist of the ones covered follow:

The 1965 Project

Around 1965 it was found that low-income children in the first, second and third grades were not able to read at the expected levels. Consequently, a special reading motivation program was launched. The project involved both the school and the home. The experiment was considered fairly successful.

Rotterdam Project

This project was designed for low income children in kindergarten through elementary. Because of very bad reporting and a lack of feedback, de Vries said that he knew little or nothing about the details of the program and was not able to tell whether it had been successful or not.

Amsterdam Project

Program was designed to place a strong emphasis on spontaneous language development. Program was poorly evaluated -- results not reliable, but generally viewed as not having achieved the desired goals.

Utrecht Project

Since large classes had traditionally been such a handicap, the Utrecht project included a component under which small groups of children were taken out of the regular class for 10 minutes each day and given special help in Reading and Arithmetic. Another component consisted of a home visitation scheme whereby a visitor from the school went into the homes once per week to work with the parents. The third element was a school readiness program which was carried on by the regular teacher.

Because the teachers in the project reached a point of almost total non-cooperation, the project failed. In spite of this, the project was evaluated with the use of a locally developed intelligence test and a translated version of one of the Illinois language tests.

Dr. de Vries did not indicate what the evaluation had specifically determined, but he did say that their evaluation experience thus far agreed with others who have found that unless there is a good follow-up program almost all of the gains realized in the special preschool programs are lost.

Dr. Magnussen's Presentation

Magnussen began his presentation by giving a background sketch on the origin, development, and mission of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. He then went on to discuss the progress and results of the work he and his group had been doing in the area of developing performance indicators relative to the field of education.

Major Thrusts of OECD Educational Work

1- An attempt to establish a framework of educational performance references which were relevant to the policy concerns of the member nations (There are 22 member nations in the organization.)

2- To develop a method for more accurate depiction of what education is, and what it is supposed to produce.

3- Develop more comprehensive measures of educational impact on society. This goes beyond the achievement of cognitive outcome measurements which are currently in use.

Broad Issues Faced

- Relevance: Does education have any real impact on the structure of society? Does society have any rational casual influence on education?

- How can the hundreds of variables be isolated and measured? Is not the sum total of all the variables far less than the total impact made by education on society?

- Achievement scores are not the only important educational outcomes, yet people continue to insist that they are.

Problems Faced

1- Although many people seek and desire a global system of educational performance indicators (like the GNP in economic affairs), such a system would be extremely difficult to construct: the valuation levels of all the reference factors would have to be weighted. Even if such a system were to be constructed, it would serve only for the nation for which it was designed because the value judgements and policy attitudes involved would vary from place to place.

-- Where such global systems have been designed, Magnussen contended, they have glossed over the value judgments and muted the internal movement, strains and stresses.

2- Policy makers are not willing to make specific, concrete announcements about educational goals and objectives (it's just not politic). This makes measurement very difficult.

Model Developed

The work of Magnussen's group has thus far produced a theoretical model with the following characteristics:

- -- Based on policy statements of the areas of concern expressed by the member nations
- -- Model seeks to discover which statistical indicators are most crucial for measuring progressive or retrogressive movement
- -- Model must be able to not only react to the information amassed, but also must be able to act upon the information, i.e. the management loop.

Six Index Areas Covered by the Model

1· Contribution of education to equality of opportunity and social skills; takes into consideration the number of people effected and quality of the knowledge and skills.

2- Contribution of education to equality of opportunity and social mobility.

3- The contribution of education to the transference of skills useful and valuable to the economic well-being of the nation.

4- Contributions of education to the full development and well-being of the individual.

5- Contribution to the transference of social, human and cultural values of the nation.

6- Contributions of education to the achievement of national policy objectives at an effective cost level.

--reported by Carter H. Collins
(40 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT:* (PART II)

"RESEARCH FROM ISRAEL ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT"

Presentations by: Dr. Moshe Smilansky
Professor of Sociology of Education
and Comparative Education, and Dean
of the Department of Educational Science,
Tel Aviv University

Dr. Sara Smilansky
Professor, Department of Psychology,
Tel Aviv University

Friday, August 25, 1972

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION BY DR. SARA SMILANSKY ON "EXPERIMENTS WITH DIFFERENT APPROACHES FOR FOSTERING INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL."

Dr. Smilansky reviewed her experience in clinical psychology in Israel and in the U.S. Her work in the psycho-therapeutic treatment of Israeli adolescents and adults convinced her that little can be done to help adults and children once they arrive at hospitals for the mentally ill. A review of records, however, showed that 99% of adults and children in Israeli hospitals for the mentally-ill perceived "some difficulty or failure" in their experience in the schools. The child or adult felt that he had learned less than other children, even when records indicated that, objectively, he had learned as much as his peers.

The importance of perceived failure to Israelis may result from the great value that Jews give to education. There is widespread hope among Israelis for increased pride and social acceptance through education, even when increases in job or income status do not result.

Iraqis, Yemenites, and other "Oriental" Jews who had been considered "Jews" in their native countries and who prized education and learning, came to Israel and found themselves classified by Jews of European origin as Iraqis or Yemenites, as people not prepared to learn, as "non-learners" from the start. The children of these Oriental Jews now constitute 65% of Israel's 1st-and 2nd-graders. On the other hand, these children go to neighborhood schools which are socioeconomically integrated through housing patterns developed in accordance with national policy. There are virtually no private schools for the wealthy. There is a sense of cohesiveness based on a common religion and a sense of national purpose and peril. The schools place emphasis on developing cognitive ability and abstract thinking so that the child may become a good soldier, a good professional, etc. In the low socioeconomic (SES) groups, the father is almost always present, as the divorce rate in that group is almost nil. The parents value education, hope that the children will learn to be like those of European origin. Parents want their children to be in school, love them, and want them to be more successful educationally than they were.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Israeli educators, given the above conditions, expected the low SES children to behave and succeed like the "Europeans." The result, however, was widespread *immediate failure* for those children. Attempts were made to give remedial help or "re-education;" but the records of hospitals for the mentally ill show that remedial efforts do not affect the child's perception of his failure relative to his peers.

Baffled by the failure of Oriental Jewish children at school, despite seemingly favorable circumstances, Dr. Smilansky left hospital work to study how those children had failed and to help develop an image of successful learning among Israeli disadvantaged children. She found that when the parent had been a successful learner, with certification to prove it, the child also perceived himself as a potentially successful learner. But when the parent had not been successful or was uneducated, the child had no basis for seeing himself as potentially successful. When the unsuccessful parent pressed the child for success in school, the parent often was hoping to prove himself, rationalizing his own lack of education as due to conditions beyond his control. The child's failure in school than became a *double* failure because the family had failed, too. The family typically blamed itself and the child, rather than the schools or "the system." Remedial efforts directed at the child could not reach the parent; as a result, child and family continued to see themselves as failures.

Efforts were made to use psychoanalysis to change the child's self-image. But psychotheapeutic methods based on verbal communication and cognitive thinking do not help such a child. At present, we just do not have methods of repairing self-blame because of school failure in people who do not have high cognitive and verbal ability.

Dr. Smilansky concludes that we must *prevent* such failure because we do not know how to cure it, and that we must raise the child's self-concept as a learner as well as raise his cognitive level.

In the U.S., Dr. Smilansky compared her findings in Israel with those of a study she conducted in Columbus, Ohio, almost two years ago. She worked with four groups of children, all of whom had been born in Columbus: (1) high socioeconomic blacks; (2) low-socioeconomic blacks; (3) high socioeconomic whites; (4) low socioeconomic whites from Appalachia. The group of high SES blacks comprised 60 families--all of which lived in the suburbs, in predominantly white, high SES zones. Their children were a small minority, with no more than four black children in any one classroom of the K-2 range in schools that were predominantly white high SES. The black children were significantly better in any area tested by her than were the low SES blacks and the low SES whites, and were often better than the high SES whites, especially in play ability and artistic ability. Their self-concept was not significantly different from that of the white high SES children. Only in verbal ability did the black high SES children score lower than the white children.

The research showed that the black high SES parent behaves with his children in accordance with precepts of currently popular texts on raising children. These parents spend as much time as possible with their children, buy more toys, permit less TV watching than do white high SES parents, go more often on trips with the children, help them more with homework, love them more through physically handling and playing with them. Such parents are very child-centered, enjoy their children, see themselves as successful parents, have a clear image of what they want the child to be--which, though unconsciously so, is very similar to that of the white parent. In other words, the "model" child for the black high SES parent is that of a well-educated, well-behaved, well-mannered, clean child - a model which is very complete and clear.

Dr. Smilansky suggests that having an educated parent--regardless of other cultural considerations--gives the child the potential ability to see himself as an educated person and gives him the help he needs to become one. In Columbus, the white family from Appalachia and the black low SES families could not give the child a self-image of a potentially successful learner. Which is more important--the image of the parent as a successful learner or the help that such a parent gives in school work? Both contribute to the child's success.

Black high SES parents came 10 times as often to talk to the teachers as did black low SES parents. The former accept the school's quality but want to sense directly what is expected of the child at school and then help him to achieve it. Such parents create an "ideal" environment for success at school and obliterate differences from the child's white peers; the question of race becomes secondary to these other considerations.

These results confirm the findings in the Israeli kibbutz, which also attempts to create an "ideal" learning environment for children. Test results in Grades 1-2 show no significant differences among children from different origins, if parent education is held constant

--which the kibbutz does.

Q. You mentioned that verbal ability was relatively lower among black high SES children. It was low among the disadvantaged Israeli children whom you tried to treat with psychoanalysis. How does one develop verbal ability when it is low?

A. It doesn't matter what media we use to develop cognitive abilities in children. Once those abilities have been developed--possibly through artistic ways to use play, drawing, clay--a transfer will take place from artistic means of cognitive development to verbal means. The child will look for the words to express what he already understands.

Q. First, I believe that there is a "credibility gap" between the black low SES parent and the school--a gap which becomes part of the child's view of school. Should we try, then, to eliminate that credibility gap somehow to help the child be more motivated to succeed in school? Second, we see that the Israeli kibbutz environment seems to eliminate that kind of credibility gap between school and parent. It is unlikely that the U.S. would set up residential schools for children on a large scale. What are the policy implications for us, then, from the kibbutz experience?

A. On the first question, I do not believe that we can "educate" low SES parents to become helpers to the teachers along the lines of black high SES parents--neither in the U.S. nor in Israel. The black high SES parent has more than knowledge of his own; he is modeling his family along textbook patterns, modeling a child very different from what the parent was as a child. I see great beauty in what is happening--a child-centered family that, unconsciously, is directed at developing a child like the white high SES child. The U.S. cannot produce such a parent through "parent education" and we have also failed to do so in Israel. Parent education is not the business of schools anyway; the important thing is that schools and parents help children to see themselves as successful learners.

The child must learn to live in two worlds--the school and the home--and to distinguish between them. The teacher is not his mother, and the expectations of the school are different from those of the home. The child should feel that he belongs to that school, which is there to help him learn and see himself as a successful learner. One implication of this is that the teacher must not compare one child's learning to that of other children, but must emphasize that all her children can and will learn. Another implication is that each teacher must have many teaching methods available and fit those methods to each child's needs to help him succeed. And, the constant message from school to home must be--"This child is always successful!"

It is unfair to the parent--who has a different role from that of the school--to expect him to do what the school cannot do. Let me emphasize that in all cultures I know of, parents love their children and want them to succeed. The school should reinforce this through reports of success to the parent, which will also boost the parent's self-esteem. Other than this, the school should keep "hands off" the parents.

Q. You've said that the high SES black gets his information on child-raising from the latest texts in the field. How would you make that information available to low SES blacks?

A. Learning to be a good parent means perceiving oneself as a successful learner, even while recognizing how much you don't know. The parent must be willing to study how to be a good parent. In Israel, however, our efforts to provide information told the parents instead that we were not satisfied with them, that somehow they were not good parents. This absolutely must not happen, and the school and teachers must avoid communicating this to the parents.

The greater the deviance between school and home, the more we must work to help the child perceive his success. Instead, teachers often believe that they can't do much to help a child and they communicate this to him, when they should rather be investing more effort in him.

Q. Did you find out how the high SES black parent "made it" in school and in life without a success model in the home?

A. No.

Q. Are there social institutions or agencies which can help the school in working with the child, especially in view of the "examination and screening" function of the school?

A. In Israel, many special centers do offer remedial work--the theory seems to be that if the child failed in the morning he must get more of the same in the afternoon. It may already be too late by then. I don't have a practical model of how schools should be, but the theoretical model that I gave you suggests that there should be different practical models for different situations. I have found that schools are so alike all over the world that it is absolutely frightening. But the children are so different. The teachers all seem the same, seem to have been trained in the same methods, with slight variations, all over the world. We need instead many practical models that are based on the development of the child as their rationale.

I believe that schools must show that they do take responsibility for the child's cognitive development and that they know how to do it. The parent should believe that the school knows how to do it. The child must learn to cope with the conflict between how the school operates and how the home operates; learning to resolve this conflict early in life will help his long-run mental health.

Q. Many of us believe that the school is part of the community. What is the role of the parent then? Isn't it necessary to give parents information on their role in order to prevent the parent's self-image from lowering?

A. Teachers should communicate with parents as learners, not as teachers. The teacher should go to the home to learn more about the child and how to help him learn at school, to use the parent as a source of information about the child. The teacher cannot and should not teach the parent how to be a "better" parent; this may be an appropriate role for other community workers, but not for the teacher.

Q. There is considerable controversy about when formal instruction for disadvantaged children should start. What do you think?

A. The earlier you start teaching reading to such a child, the better for him. We start in Israel at age 4 in the belief that reading should be part of very early education for the disadvantaged. Early reading seems not to make a difference for the advantaged child. The point is that you must introduce reading early and continue it as a successful activity from the child's point to view, then you will get far fewer children needing remedial reading.

We tried introducing reading at age 5 to disadvantaged Israeli children, and found 30% failing at the end of kindergarten. By the end of the first grade, however, they were doing better than disadvantaged children who did not start on reading until the first grade. It may be that such children need an "incubation" period in a non-pressured, kindergarten atmosphere.

Q. Would it be preferable to introduce reading in a non-pressured, relaxed way at a later age?

A. I think not. We found that introducing reading at age 7 leads to an even higher rate of failure.

Q. You say that schools should build success for children and not compare the child to his peers. What about the competitive nature of many schools and their reward systems for "excellence"?

A. Each child should be able to enjoy reading up to the level of his ability and the school must help him in this. I really question just how much "knowledge" is imparted by schools to children anyway, yet the schools often try to reward accumulations of knowledge. They should be helping the child to enjoy art, music, and creative play.

Our afternoon session began with Dr. Smilansky's description of sociodramatic play an an ideal means for developing the congitive, social and emotional abilities of the disadvantaged child--much more so than trying to develop cognitive ability through verbal activity. Her research in Israel, however, showed that disadvantaged children typically do not play well, confirming Bloom's findings in the United States. Experimentation showed that it is possible to intervene successfully in the play behavior of the disadvantaged; such intervention is not necessary for the advantaged child. who already plays well.

Can teachers intervene successfully? Dr. Smilansky's publications deal with the importance of play, but one unanticipated result of her work was guilt feelings among teachers who accepted the importance of play behavior but did not know how to intervene effectively. This happens often--we identify an education problem and then pass it to the teacher without telling her how to resolve it. The result is frustration and guilt feelings for the teacher.

The discussion turned to problems of parent education and parent involvement in schools, which had been a focus of the morning session. Dr. Smilansky referred to three recent experiments in Israel. In her first experiment, parents of high and of low SES children were invited to make ten observations each of their children's classrooms, parties and play activities. She interviewed the parents afterwards to find out what they had liked or not liked, then interviewed their children to find out what the parents had told them. In the second experiment, an attempt was made to help parents--usually the mother--teach the child. Observations were made on how mothers learned and how they taught their children. In the third experiment, pregnant mothers-to-be were trained in an integrated socioeconomic group to teach children.

The results of the three experiments were all negative. The parents were all eager to learn but, said Dr. Smilansky, "what we did is exactly what we should not do." For the first experiment, the SES parents felt that classroom situations were unstructured and that children were merely drawing, playing, or "doing nothing." Generally, the school was quite different--disappointingly so--from what they had expected to find. High SES parents felt that classes were too structured and that children had too little opportunity to play and be creative. They too were disappointed in what they saw. All the parents communicated their disappointment and misgivings to their children. The only exception was a small group of parents whose children were in religious schools and who found there exactly what they had expected.

Dr. Smilansky's conclusion was that if we expect parents to come to school and then reinforce at home what the school is doing, we must show them exactly what they expect at school. The Israeli schools had wanted to show the parents what to do at home--and got disappointment and antagonism instead. Schools should not teach only what parents expect--nor should parents have the burden of deciding what schools should teach. If we invite a parent to school, we should show him what he wants and expects to see so that he can and will reinforce that at home.

Q. Minority parents often like to be invited to school and feel that they are involved, that they have an input to the school and can discuss and criticize what is going on. How would you deal with their desire and intention to "have the system listen to them"?

A. We found that low SES parents come significantly more to school when invited than do high SES parents. One way to use this is an approach used in our control group, which did not come to classes but came to afternoon play and remedial activities. They were more favorable about what they saw and about the schools and teachers. You must remember, however, that Israeli parents of disadvantaged children do not have the feelings of mistrust towards the schools that their counterparts in the United States seem to have.

Q. I am still not clear on how the Israeli experience is relevant for the United States. In this country, teachers, administrators and even communities do not always see the child as a resource whose potential is to be developed. They may see him as a burden, a problem child, and they may neglect and hurt him. That is why many minority parents here mistrust the schools and insist on participation in, and control over, the schools. What you have said today really confirms our expectation that minority parents will meet many difficulties and opposition in gaining control over their schools.

A. In Israel, as often in the United States, parents are eager to learn how to help their children. But we do not train teachers to teach parents, so teachers do not know how to do this and should not try to. To teach someone effectively, you must have empathy with them and convince them that they are learning from you.

Q. What can we do about the attitudes of teachers and administrators, which you mentioned? How can we get them to stop blaming the home for the child's failures at school?

A. Simply telling the teacher that she is accountable for the child's learning does not help her. You must work with her, help her to learn new ways to help the child. When she knows how to do that, her attitudes towards the child will change.

Q. You tell us that we cannot replicate the ideal home situation of the high SES black child, and we cannot replicate the ideal "home" environment provided by the kibbutz to many Israeli children. What then can we do? We find that parents and community groups often force the school to see the child as a potential learner--they must get involved in school decision-making if the school is to do what it should. Our questions to you underline our frustrations--how can we make it better? Perhaps we should ask how we could best use our resources once the community makes the commitment that the schools will do certain things for children.

A. Any community can bring in teachers who believe that every child can learn to read, write, calculate, and do abstract thinking better than he can now. I have said that schools and teachers should have available many methods and techniques to fit a child's needs. If we can get three schools like that, we will have many different teaching methods already at work. Then we bring in the parents to see how successful the child is at school, and the parents will reinforce this at home.

The teacher should go into the homes to get information to help the child develop; if she does not need that information, she should not repeatedly visit the home. If the child does not progress, the teacher must visit the home again and again--not to teach the parent, but to understand why the child is not progressing. It may be that other resources will be needed to help in the home situation, perhaps some agency specialized in helping a parent to cope with the parent's problems--but that agency is not the school or the teacher. With this approach, parents will believe in such a school and be proud of it.

Finally, our longitudinal study of the effect of trying to teach mothers to teach children showed how devastating the results were for the home. There was some increase in the child's reading achievement, but a terrible price was paid in stresses, quarrels, and the weakening of family relationships. It is simply too much to ask of a busy, hard-pressed parent.

Q. Is the problem then one of proper selection and training of teachers?

A. I believe that those who want to teach should become teachers, and that it is up to us to train them. That training must continue while they are teachers. Look at how highly selected and trained are our doctors--but they insist on, and have, many kinds of supporting staff and services. Yet, the teacher is usually expected to do everything by herself. She needs support and empathy, which the administrator cannot provide because of his role. Someone else has to help provide alternative methods and concepts; in other words, "every teacher needs a teacher before she or he fails." But the teacher's teacher has to believe in her and believe that she can help her.

Another way to help the teacher is to be more flexible in assigning pupils to teachers. If the school is truly geared to developing each child, there will be that flexibility, rather than insistence that a "good" teacher be able to teach any and every child. I could again compare the school's needs with those of a clinic, where many skills and concepts are available among the staff and several "treatment" methods will thus be available to patients. Why shouldn't schools be organized in the same way?

330

In closing, Dr. Smilansky noted that being poor means having certain disadvantages--such as low verbal ability and low socio-dramatic play ability--which are "frighteningly similar" across races, cultures and nations. But, the United States has made and is making a unique effort in the history of education to overcome those disadvantages, and is a model of effort and hope to other nations also struggling with similar problems.

--reported by Edward B. Glassman

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR REPORT*

"EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD IN COMMUNIST CHINA"

MRS. RUTH SIDEL
Comprehensive Child Care Project, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York, New York

Wednesday, November 29, 1972

General Comments

Mrs. Ruth Sidel presented background information on the trip to China (her second in as many years) in which she was accompanied by her husband, Dr. Victor Sidel, also of Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Dr. Paul Dudley White, and Dr. Sam Rosen. Using slides to supplement her remarks, Mrs. Sidel said that the itinerary of the two trips to China were primarily to look at education activities, including emphasis upon daycare facilities and urban neighborhood projects.

China is 80 percent rural; it has about 800,000,000 people. Its people work very hard and have very little mechanization. A commune of 50,000 people might have only two tractors, but will have 100 carts pulled by people.

Consumer goods are in relatively ample supply. They had expected to see a shortage of food, but this was apparently not the case. Basketball is almost as popular a sport as pingpong. There are no actively practiced religious beliefs, and the Buddhist temples are preserved only as museums.

Crime does not appear to be a serious problem in China. There is a problem with pickpocketing, and there are occasional homicides. The attitude towards prison treatment is very progressive; the Chinese feel that you cannot re-educate people if you don't treat them well while they are behind bars.

Picture-taking was permitted everywhere, with the exception of airports. The Sidels were also impressed with the fact that not one beggar or panhandler was seen.

Drugs are no longer the problem they were in the 1950's, at which time a massive campaign was undertaken to combat it. Addicts are treated very much like physically ill people.

---

*This is one of a series of reports of ESS activities published for the benefit of staff aides who were not able to attend the meeting. These reports are published for informational purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement of particular educational policies or practices.

Almost everyone in China gets married, although marriage does not take place as early as in this country. Children mature generally about four years later than American children do. Girls, for example, will not start menstruating until they are 16 or 17 years old.

Pollution and environmental concerns are just beginning to get attention in China. This is coupled with a desire to greatly increase production of consumer goods, but they are aware of the problems in the West with regard to the pollution which comes about from increasing production.

The Peoples Liberation Army is very popular with the teenagers. Many children's games and toys center around the boy's military roles and the girl's honoring them with flowers, etc.

There is evidently a de-emphasis of Mao's influence currently in effect in China, but the impact of his presence and writings is still extremely strong in many obvious ways.

The Chinese society is unique in many ways, and features some attitudes that are healthy and desirable. People generally do things together. Whole families work together, including the children. This probably is because of the lack of mechanization. However, the Chinese culture is such that this closeness would probably exist regardless of external influences.

One of the important heroes to the Chinese is Dr. Norman Bethune, a Canadian medical practitioner who lived in China for many years, treated soldiers and who himself contracted a disease and died. He is revered as being a real friend of the Chinese.

Most workers live in duplex-style apartments built along lanes, with inner courtyards. There are the beginnings now of high-rise workers' apartments. China is still a very poor society, and the Chinese will admit to this. The majority of the financial resources are directed into the public factor. The life of the "bitter past" -- their description of life in China prior to the Communist takeover -- was worse by far than it is today, according to them.

Public telephones are available, but there are virtually no private phone systems. Public buildings are the only buildings in China that are decorated on holidays, like October 1 which celebrates the Communist "liberation" of the Chinese mainland.

Women's Liberation

Chinese Communists have believed in liberation of women since at least the 1940's. "Public Bitterness" sessions were encouraged, where local women were invited to tell of their terribly deprived lives. Local women were prompted to talk about tough problems they faced. At first they were quite reluctant, but they were able to loosen up with the help of local "plants." Footbinding ended only in the 1940's. Until recently, women were never educated outside the home.

Today, women work in health care, neighborhood social centers (50,000 per neighborhood). Midwives take care of most illnesses. Hospital care is reserved only for more seriously ill people.

A most important aspect regarding women's liberation is their contribution to the Chinese society. There is a very intensive birth control campaign, which is quite effective. Women are advised that in not having children they are making a great contribution to the society. Women also have been trained as health professionals who go from door to door, distributing information on birth control.

Another important aspect of women's liberation in China, is that women work because they want to "make revolution" -- they want to contribute their talents to society. In this sense, "revolution" is the building of the society rather than revolting against it.

Thirty to forty percent of Chinese doctors are women. Over fifty percent of the medical students are women. Nevertheless, Chinese women are still not in positions of authority. They may be doctors, but they do not have administrative power in the medical field.

Day Care Centers

Ninety percent of the people in the city work -- a lesser percentage work in the country outside their farm areas. A very popular concept of "multiple mothering" is employed where both mother and father work. New infants are placed in day care centers and receive "love" from several different mothers. These women are usually middle-aged or grandmothers. Small kids are cared for by older children. The idea of love is everywhere.

A teacher is not just a teacher -- she has considerably more responsibility. She is a symbol of mother, with authority and affection displayed toward her charges beyond the expected level in the West.

Women get 56 days of maternity leave. After this period, the infants are placed in nursing rooms at the factory. The mothers are given time off twice a day to breastfeed them. People who take care of nursing rooms are called "aunties."

Most children aged 3-7 go to kindergartens, and approximately 50 percent of China's babies go to state nurseries, the other half remaining in the care of grandparents.

Education

It is interesting to note that mentally retarded children are kept in class with regular students; there are no special reading groups. The approach is for the good of the society or the class as a whole, with few exceptions.

In kindergartens, the emphasis is on taking care of yourself and taking good care of each other -- as directed by Chairman Mao. In other words, because he says it is important to the society that you take care of yourself and others, there is no question but that you do so.

Kindergarten sessions can take place six days a week. All books used in the class, to no great surprise, are politically oriented. There are approximately 27-30 in each class, with three teachers assigned to tend to them. But it must be remembered that the role of the teacher in the classroom in China is much more significant in terms of responsibilities than in the West.

In the primary grades, there is one teacher with 45-48 pupils. There appears to be less need at this level for the individualized approach which exists in the kindergarten, considering the pupil-teacher ratio.

In the school rooms, the students sit two by two -- boy-girl, boy-girl. This kind of arrangement discourages excessive playing around. The rooms are crowded, but the students sit with hands folded in their laps, and are very well behaved. Kids are attentive and silent -- certainly not posing any problems regarding discipline, but one must wonder about the lack of participation or spontaneity that characterizes the Chinese classroom, and the other kinds of problems that might result from a stifling atmosphere such as this.

Interestingly enough, however, Chinese youngsters appear not to have complexes that are obviously detected. They are not shy and they do not object to performing, and will unhesitatingly do so. The overall feeling is one of enormous gaiety and satisfaction with one's way of life.

The middle school in China includes three junior high school grades, plus two senior high grades. A pupil's continuing education program will depend on and is determined by (1) political ideology expressed by the student; (2) academic achievement; and (3) physical fitness. Athletics are very important in the school day beginning with the primary schools. Exercise is stressed.

These requirements are slowly changing, now that the Cultural Revolution is over. Education is more easily available to more people, and more students will be going on to more education. The Chinese today are trying to lessen the gap between intellectual and manual labor -- it is no longer a question of what your degree is, but whether you can do the job; and this is encouraging people to be motivated by altruism rather than by self-interest.

It is currently very hard to get into the university program. During the Cultural Revolution, everyone had to go to work after eight years of school. The students selected for a higher education would be chosen by members of the commune -- not by members of the higher education community. Schools would have the right to deny any student they didn't think would make it, however. Children of peasants are given preference in higher education over children of professional people.

During the Cultural Revolution, many schools were closed -- and these are gradually reopening. Major changes in the administration of the schools include: shorter curriculums (medical school training is reduced from six years to three); more practical work is involved in the training now (you go to the countryside and work and learn in the first year; you then go on to basics in the second year; and the third year is spent in formal hospital work).

The program of cultural enrichment is not so much in the hands of the people who are knowledgeable or expert in the area, but in the hands of the local political organizations which control the administration.

Asked if she had any negative comments with regard to China today, Mrs. Sidel responded that the kids are very quiet, in our way of life in the West a rather unhealthy sign. Also, the more obvious fact that the Chinese people are not able to read anything they wish, since the government very carefully controls whatever is printed.

Reported by Donald F. Berens
(45 participants)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SUITE 610 / 2000 L STREET, NORTHWEST / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 / (202) 293-3166

APPENDIX I

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

PURPOSES

ESS is designed to assist professional staff members in the field of education, who are employed by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government, to obtain a more realistic understanding of current educational practices and problems and to improve communications between Washington educational staff members and educators in the field. It particularly strives to develop bridges between educational researchers and policy makers so that both endeavors may be enhanced.

ESS seeks to increase staff understanding and awareness of contemporary problems in American education and to supplement their Washington work experiences with a variety of inservice training seminars and in-the-field personal observations. Emphasis in these voluntary and supplementary learning experiences is upon developing broad educational understanding and perspective and a wide exposure to current educational problems. ESS advocates no particular educational policies nor does it take positions on pending legislative controversies.

Stated another way, ESS provides educational experiences to help overcome the gap discussed by John W. Gardner in Self-Renewal:

> "As organizations (and societies) become larger and more complex, the men at the top (whether managers or analysts) depend less and less on firsthand experience, more and more on heavily "processed" data. Before reaching them, the raw data--what actually goes on "out there"--have been sampled, screened, condensed, compiled, coded, expressed in statistical form, spun into generalizations and crystallized into recommendations.
>
> "It is characteristic of the information processing system that it systematically filters out certain kinds of data so that these never reach the men who depend on the system..... It filters out all sensory impressions not readily expressed in words and numbers. It filters out emotion, feeling, sentiment, mood and almost all of the irrational nuances of human situations. It filters out those intuitive judgments that are just below the level of consciousness.
>
> "So that the picture of reality that sifts to the top of our great organizations and our society is sometimes a dangerous mismatch with the real world.....

> "That is why every top executive and every analyst sitting at the center of a communications network should periodically emerge from his world of abstractions and take a long unflinching look at unprocessed reality."

One outcome of the ESS program, it is hoped, is a greater appreciation of the importance of evaluation in educational programs--an emphasis on "what works" and how it might be stimulated elsewhere through appropriate Federal actions.

ESS's goal, in short, is to enable its participants to be generally more effective in their professional staff duties and of greater service to the Congress and the Executive Branch in the development and enactment of sound educational policies.

PARTICIPANTS

ESS participants are varied in their political affiliations and persuasions; they are Republicans, Democrats, and independents. The major criterion for participation in ESS activities is occupational: the individual must perform in a Federal professional staff role involving the development or implementation of Federal policy in the field of education. Hence, ESS activities typically bring together Federal aides from four areas:

Congressional: Majority and minority counsels and professional staff members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the House Committee on Education and Labor, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations; as well as legislative assistants to Members of the House and Senate who serve on the Congressional committees on education. In addition, professional staff of the Congressional Research Service, and the General Accounting Office

Executive Offices: Professionals from the Office of Management and Budget (Human Resources Programs Division, Office of Legislative Reference, Office of Program Coordination, Federal Executive Board Secretariat) and special assistants to the President.

Departments: The Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of HEW, Commissioner of Education, Director of the National Institute of Education, Deputy Assistant Secretaries for program planning and evaluation, legislation, budget, research and intradepartmental educational affairs. In addition, senior program specialists, public information officers, special assistants to bureau chiefs, etc.

Agencies: Professional staff members of other Federal education agencies: National Science Foundation, Office of Economic Opportunity, National Endowment for the Humanities, Smithsonian Institution, etc.

ACTIVITIES

ESS activities generally take the form of either dinner-discussion meetings with prominent personalities in the field of education or site visits to notable educational programs.

Travelling seminars" typically consist of 15-25 senior, bipartisan staff embers from Congress and the Executive departments whose primary responsiilities are for the development and implementation of Federal educational olicy. Dinner meetings serve a wider spectrum of educational staff personel drawn from Capitol Hill and various Federal agencies.

he general format of ESS activities is as follows:

A. ESS participants obtain the written approval and/or encouragement of heir congressional or agency principals. (ESS has been endorsed by Senators nd Representatives of both political parties, as well as Executive Branch gency heads.)

B. ESS participants suggest an agenda of educational topics (e.g. "prechool," "disadvantaged," "educational technology"). The ESS project staff, n cooperation with an outside consultant-expert in the particular topic or ocale, then plans the site visit to worthwhile educational programs and makes he necessary logistical arrangements.

C. The group travels together, sometimes under the leadership of the outside onsultant, in short trips from Washington to educational projects. (Eighten trips during the course of a calendar year are planned in accordance with he congressional workload and the budgetary cycle.) In the field, ESS partiipants view and discuss educational operations with persons they would not ormally meet in Washington (e.g. classroom teachers, community leaders, adinistrators, researchers, students, parents, etc.).

PONSORSHIP AND CONTROL

ducational Staff Seminar commenced operations in February 1969 and is one f a series of leadership development programs of The George Washington niversity's Institute for Educational Leadership. ESS is funded by a grant to the Institute from The Ford Foundation and by a contract for partial reimursement of training expenses from the U.S. Office of Education, the Department f Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A Steering Committee for ESS, composed of participants representing various agency affiliations, meets regularly to give advice and counsel to the program.

ESS's Director is Dr. Samuel Halperin, formerly a college professor of political science, Assistant U.S. Commissioner of Education for Legislation, and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Assistant Director Jonathan Brown has worked with Federal educational policy as an assistant to a U.S. Representative and a U.S. Senator. ESS's Administrative Officer is Ms. Dietra Rogers. Its Administrative Assistant is Ms. Ann Hymes.

--February 1973